THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE OF PROGRESS IN RELIGION

Library of the
PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
Berkeley, California

JULY 1915

"Speak unto this people that they go forward"

New York Chicago
San Antonio

Unity Hymns and Chorals

NEW EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

A NOBLE SUCCESSOR TO A MUCH LOVED HYMN BOOK

Edited by Frederick L. Hosmer and William C. Gannett

This book is meeting the expectations of the old friends.

Single copies, 50 cents. By mail, 60 cents. Fifty or more copies, to one address, 45 cents each. Boxing and carriage additional. Please indicate whether by freight or express. Sample copies for inspection by church committee sent on approval, returnable if not desired.

SEND ORDERS TO

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE

CHICAGO

CHURCH ART and MEMORIAL GIFTS and FURNISHINGS in WOOD METAL, STONE and MARBLE, ART GLASS, MURAL DECORATION, MOSAIC; etc., TABLETS to RECORD, MONUMENTS of SPECIAL DESIGN from Client's Instructions

Correspondence Invited. Ask for Illustrated Data and Photographs

J. & R. Lamb

Studios, 23-25-27 Sixth Avenue NEW YORK

New York Unitarian Headquarters

104 East Twentieth Street

Unitarian Books and Literature on Sale.

Subscriptions received for denomination periodicals.

Tracts and other descriptive literature for free distribution.

And always a cordial welcome for all visitors.

Miss Anna L. Wentz,
Clerk

The Unitarian Advance

A Monthly Magazine of Progress in Religion

GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ERNEST C. SMITH, Assistant Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: John Haynes Holmes, Edgar S. Wiers, George R. Gebauer, Alson H. Robinson, Albert R. Vail, Frederick R. Griffin, Everett D. Martin, J. E. Williams, Charles P. Wellman.

VOLUME FIVE

SEPTEMBER, 1914—July 1915

NEW YORK CHICAGO SAN ANTONIO

This magazine was established as THE NEW UNITARIAN, January, 1906. The second year, its name was changed to THE UNITARIAN; and in September, 1910, its name was changed to THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE.

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ERNEST C. SMITH, Assistant Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:—John Haynes Holmes, Edgar S. Wiers, George R. Gebauer, Alson H. Robinson, Albert R. Vail, Frederick R. Griffin, Everett D. Martin, J. E. Williams, Charles P. Wellman.

CONTENTS FOR JULY, 1915

PAGE

Our High Resolve 322

Editorials 323

The Universalists and Billy Sunday 326

A Neighborly Testimonial 326

New Books 327

John Haynes Holmes on Billy Sunday 327

Positive Unitarianism ..... *Maxwell Savage* 328

Sin and Atonement ..... *Troward H. Marshall* 334

The Modern Church and Social Justice: If in War, Why Not in Peace? ..... *John Haynes Holmes* 336

Our Readers' Exchange: Equal Franchise Once More ..... *F. A. W.* 339

Western Conference News 341

Report of Comity Committee 347

Your Rosebud Child, *a Poem* ..... *James G. Townsend* 348

The Journey, *a Poem* ..... *Harriet Lake-Burch* 348

Fellowship Notices 346, 348

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:—Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, of New York; Rev. Jabez T. Sunderland, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Pres. Franklin C. Southworth, of Meadville, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Van Ness, of Boston; Rev. Wilson M. Backus, of Minneapolis, Minn.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—One Dollar. Send remittance by check or money order, made payable to THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, and addressed to the office of our Treasurer, 105 South Dearborn St., Chicago.

Office of Publication: MOUNT MORRIS, ILL.

NEW YORK, 61 East 34th Street. CHICAGO, 105 S. Dearborn Street.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Mount Morris, Ill.

Our High Resolve

SINCE there is at the present time a special interest in religious questions, and since the current revivalism is setting forth a crude and false doctrine and is attacking Unitarians and what the name Unitarian represents; and since wars and general disturbances are stirring the minds of people here and abroad to consider more carefully the fundamental things of thought and life;

RESOLVED, That we make special efforts during this year to meet this need and opportunity by more directly and zealously studying and teaching the principles of our faith; by employing men and women in places where Unitarianism is unknown or misunderstood; by reaching out into the neighborhoods about our established churches with special meetings; by entering more aggressively upon work in our churches; by printing tracts suited to the peculiar needs of the time; by encouraging the writing and printing of books on timely subjects treated from our point of view; by making grants of money as far as funds permit to local enterprises for spreading our ideas; and by any means which the officers and agents of the American Unitarian Association or other workers can devise to increase during the year an interest in the sane and beneficent religion which is committed to our care.

Adopted at the Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association, 1915.

The Unitarian Advance

Formerly The Unitarian—Established 1906

Volume V JULY, 1915 Number 11

IT WAS very plain that the animating spirit of our recent Anniversary Meetings in Boston (as indeed has been the case at nearly all recent denominational gatherings), was a spirit of vital "GET-TOGETHER." Finding real things to do, our people are ridding themselves of the habit of disporting in the pastime of "scrapping" over unreal things. According to our notion, some of the things agreed upon at Boston were logically absurd; but the total value of everything done was constructively effectual. We are all obviously becoming rather impatient at our own past complaisance, and eager to stand together for a vigorous campaign of forward-going. May we venture to hint, however, that past seasons of "scrapping," with all their disagreeableness, have helped to bring this situation about? The "unreal things" which they involved were such only in comparison with worthier issues now emergent, and the awakening tonic of the clash of "those opposed" with those enamored with smug tranquility as a sole method of well being, has contributed somewhat, we dare believe, to the very alertness of spirit now eager for the "Get-together" for constructive efficiency. But one has to confess that another factor enters also. Missionary activity is the keynote of the day—a sterner sense of responsibility, a more alert consciousness of exceptional opportunity. Billy Sunday is a part of the reason for this.

* * *

WE ARE glad that the dominant resolution for activity passed at the Boston meetings did not mention Billy Sunday by name; though "current revivalism setting forth a crude and false doctrine and attacking Unitarians and what the name Unitarian represents," comes pretty near to being explicit designation. The bald fact is that Billy Sunday has forced the issue upon us. We have been complaisantly congratulating ourselves that the world was all coming our way in essential faith; all literature breathing our spirit; all science revealing our gospel; all modern philosophy reinforcing our dominant positions; all humanitarian movements of philanthropy and reform interpreting themselves in terms of our ideals, and all the great religious denominations of the land silently but rapidly "edging our way" in all their subtle modernizations—when all at once this crass and blatant recrudescence of archaic orthodoxy becomes the arresting note of current religion; its champion holds the spot-light on the stage of the hour's religious interest, and the crowds all seem moving his way. Whereupon we Unitarians feel ourselves impelled to sit up and take notice—and behold, we discover that we have a Mission!

* * *

THIS is not a new story. The record of Unitarian progress has another chapter in it startlingly like this, which most of us have forgotten, but which it may be serviceable for us just now to recall. When in the early part of the nineteenth century the "Unitarian Controversy" first began, it looked as though the new rationalism must inevitably sweep the country, it was so reasonable, beautiful—and easy. All American literature was with us; the best of American scholarship stood to our line; dominant men in public affairs inclined our way; and Thomas Jefferson's prophecy that in another generation practically all thinking men would be in the Unitarian ranks, did not seem unreasonable. Our program of progress seemed so fateful that it could easily be left to take care of itself. Then came the great revival movements sweeping the country for evangelicalism. The Orthodox Congregational church of New England, sadly depleted by the loss of proud old churches to Liberalism, quickly regained more than they lost, and all over the country the "peril of rationalism" was averted through the fervor of pentecostal grace. Then the friends of complaisant Unitarianism began to rub their eyes and wonder what could be done about it—and the first

missionary impulse of the American Unitarian Association was felt, though sadly retarded by the counter tradition of our ultra-individualism. We could not then to any efficient degree match the resolute fervor of Calvinistic revivalism with our rather pallid zest for the new faith. We only tried a little.

* * *

AND NOW, in the year nineteen hundred fifteen, Billy Sunday is discovered to have been existing for almost a decade as an anti-Unitarian and anti-progressive ferment in religious development with which we really ought to reckon; and therefore we are aroused to a new eagerness of missionary responsibility. We rejoice for it. And as we are amongst those who believe that Billy Sunday is incidentally doing some other good in the world besides arousing Unitarians to a realization of their mission, we have perhaps more to rejoice about than many of our brethren. But for us all the challenge of the issue is hearty, animating, integrating. Let's all get together before the challenge; let's all *"make special effort during this year"* as the resolution reads; let's use a dramatic situation with all the drama of immediate efficiency that lies in us. It is splendidly worth while. We have a gospel ten-thousand-times-ten-thousand-fold more beautiful, rational, inspiring and consecrating than Billy Sunday ever had. Let's prove to the world that besides being beautiful and rational, this gospel really works!

* * *

THE PASSING of resolutions is interesting business, though sometimes not very profitable and occasionally very illogical. We all like to put ourselves—and our neighbors—"on record" about vital issues. And there is reason in the impulse which prompts delegates to religious organizations to seek to make their organizations of religion give voice to ideals interpreting their religion in terms of things actually going on in the world. The American Unitarian Association is "on record" as endorsing the Equal Franchise, though we are by no means sure how large a minority of vigorous Unitarian men and women are on the other side. The Association is "on record" as having "hearty sympathy with the aims and work" of the Unitarian Temperance Society—which is frankly committed to the issue of national prohibition, though we suspect that an honest poll of Unitarian laymen throughout the country would hardly show unanimity as to the wisdom of that particular method of fighting intemperance. During some rather heated moments of discussion, we are informed, the Association had no little embarrassment as to just what terms of approval it should have for the President of the United States, and finally brought itself to a decision which could be unanimous largely because it could be interpreted to mean anything that any sane man means in his individual incident of sanity. And the Unitarian Fellowship of Social Justice placed itself "on record" in endorsement of an anti-enlistment proposition which we suspect would be gloriously forgotten if the eager young men in that fellowship should ever find themselves actually confronted by an issue such as that confronting England and Canada today.

* * *

ARE "resolutions" then futile and illogical? We think not. We believe in the productive value of vigorous expressions of ideals; and we believe very much in the productive value of the frequently painful processes of endeavoring to compass such expressions in resolute form. Sometimes it wastes time; sometimes it creates bad feelings; very often it brings about silly results. We cannot help feeling that in light of the splendid opportunity of saying something infinitely better, the resolution of the Association regarding President Wilson at this crisis reached the acme of dignified silliness. Yet after all it is worth while making ourselves vocal on the issues of the day, if only in blundering fashion. For this very reason, however, we agree heartily with the *Christian Register* that greater pains should be taken to have such resolutions presented in forms that are adequate, catholic, and reassuring. The reason why so much time is taken every year at all our great religious gatherings with the annoying discussion of "resolutions of opinion" that divide the house, is that such resolutions are generally presented in haphazard, ill-digested and inaccurately phrased terms, with too vehement insistence on irrele-

vant or extreme statements. Why not insist that all such resolutions be submitted to a Standing Committee on Resolutions at least two weeks before the meeting of the body that is to pass upon them; and that this committee be charged with the responsibility of putting them into final form, with public hearings, perhaps, as the *Register* suggests? This does not mean that ultimate decision must not rest with the delegates themselves; but at any rate every such resolution would start fair. We cannot help believing, for instance, that almost every minister or thoughtful layman in the denomination could have phrased a resolution of approval of our National Administration at this juncture which would have said more *that we all agree to,* and have said it more nobly—than was said in the hastily patched-up compromise which finally passed in Boston.

* * *

A RECENT issue of the *Congregationalist* contains an illuminating letter from a grieved clergyman of that fellowship pleading for "peace"—not among the nations of Europe and America—but among the churches of the Congregational communion. "Why must we have revived periodically," he complains, "the effort to bring the Unitarians into the Congregational fold? Why should a few over-zealous brethren be everlastingly insisting that we take some step that practically denies our consistent allegiance to the fundamentals of evangelical Christianity?" The immediate cause of dismay was a genial proposition amongst the "Suffolk West Association of Congregational Ministers" that all ministers of congregationally-organized churches who can subscribe to the Kansas City Statement, be eligible for membership. The proposition as finally adopted made the action individual for the case of each minister involved, but the discussion over its adoption is reported to have been very vigorous, and a note of alarm has gone forth amongst neighboring Congregationalists because of it. Direful consequences are involved, suggests this man from Springfield, which as it happens, is some miles away from "Suffolk West."

Do not these brethren see that if they persist in this endeavor they will only bring about the result of a hundred years ago? It simply means a split in the Congregational denomination. Can we afford this? If this move is persisted in, I, for one, am ready to transfer my standing to the Presbyterian body. Others will do the same. Churches will follow the pastors. But why, I ask again, must we be disturbed by this move which appears periodically in one form or another? Just as we get the denominational affairs running smoothly, somebody has to arise and cast this old divisive question into the denomination gatherings.

* * *

WE CONFESS we have no hope or expectation that the lines separating New England Congregationalists into two camps are soon to be eradicated. It would not be wise that they should be, just yet. The honest and sincere work of both the Unitarians and the Orthodox Congregationalists would suffer restraint should such an end be too precipitately urged. The difficulty is that too many men of faith fail to realize that congenial relations of good fellowship crossing denominational borders may in no wise impair vigorous loyalties to conflicting theologies, if within those conflicting theologies persists a common supreme ideal which all may share. The great discovery which churches need to make in behalf of valid movements toward church unity in our day, is not some method of compromising assimilation or some program of faith-surrendering irenics—but some vital spirit of essential fellowship and sympathy of neighborliness amongst those whom circumstances have placed in different households of faith, yet live on the same great highway of Christian progress. The Project of the Suffolk West Association seems to approach this problem in quite the right way. Indeed, what the editor of the *Congregationalist* says on this matter quite corresponds with our own conviction.

We are glad to note the spirit of good-will and of serious consideration for the broad interests of the work of Christ in all quarters of the earth which appeared in this discussion. The time is hardly ripe, perhaps anywhere, for the sudden effacement of what we call denominational boundary lines. The immediate identification of any single communion with any other is likely in the present condition of opinion among the churches to carry dangers of a division in one or both of the communions involved. It would also be an altogether new and a questionable arrangement for a man to hold ministerial standing in the recognized organizations of two communions at one and the same time. The

present boundary lines are related to strong convictions of great bodies of Christians in the past. We must rise above them, rather than tear them down. It would seem wise, moreover, in the case of a definite movement toward such an assimilation with any other body of Christians, that utterance and action should have behind it the Congregational communion as a whole, rather than the voice of a local body, representing only the opinion of its own memebers.

Nothing was done or said in the proposal of this action, or the discussions which have followed, which shou'd in any way lessen the cordial relations of Congregationalists with men of other communions, and nothing has been done to make the door of entrance to the Congregational ministry more difficult than before to any man of full qualifications who is in accordance with the spirit of our accepted statement of doctrine and with the work which we are seeking to do for the honor of Christ and the embodiment of his sense of human brotherhood in the life of the churches and of the world.

THE UNIVERSALISTS AND BILLY SUNDAY.

A RECENT editorial in the *Universalist Leader* speaks thus vigorously of the attitude of that body to the crass protagonist of twentieth century revivalistic relation who seems to have so got on the nerves of so many liberal people:

Brethren, let us be fair. We are at the bar of judgment rather than Billy Sunday! The horrible pity of it all that the world runs mad after such a caricature of the Christian ministry, and we are only stirred to criticism, when we should be stirred to action and to sacrifice to make good our own discipleship! The hours we spend in condemning his bad grammar, his vulgarity, his irreverence, were far better spent in bearing our superior message, in its superior form, to those who have need. Nor can we hide our guilt behind the claim that we are preaching the truth in our churches every Sunday, and if people want it they have but to come and get it, and if they do not come, it is their own fault. Our commission as minitsers of Jesus Christ commands that we go, yes, *go* into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.

We sorrow that the unfaithfulness of the great cultured ministry of the church has made possible such a ministerial calamity as Billy Sunday! But let us be just in apportioning the blame, taking our own share with meekness.

It is not our thought that those who have the larger equipment of intellectual and spiritual fitting to bear the real message of the Gospel, are to attempt the methods of the mountebank, but there is a way to get the Gospel to the people in all its strength and purity, and it is not a new method, for it is but the method of the Master himself, who gave himself with his message, and the common people heard him gladly, because he was in the message he gave. He did not shut himself away behind lofty walls, and then try to toll the people in with winsome music or spectacular display to consider his philosophy as he discoursed through a dull half-hour; he went out to the people as they were in his day to carry life and hope and joy and worth and health and happiness. Today his method would be subject to variation, beacuse he was a wise man, but who can imagine him today drawing a large salary and living in luxury while the people perish for the bread of life, and the cause for which he gave himself centuries ago suffers defeat?

We do not defend Billy Sunday; we do not side with him. We deplore him beyond speech, but he is a fact in the religious life of today not to be ignored. His coming should teach the Christian ministry a lesson, and his going mark a genuine revival which will bring into this present world some measure of the kingdom of heaven.

A NEIGHBORLY TESTIMONIAL.

IT IS always interesting to overhear what a neighbor not of the household has to say about our domestic affairs; and the Editor of *The Congregationalist* in making the following comment on our recent Association meetings in Boston, with cordial tribute to our denominational "Chief Executive," gives finer significance to that cordiality by affixing his initials to his writing:

The American Unitarian Association, which held its annual meeting in Boston last week did not give vent to precisely the same opinions regarding Billy Sunday that are held by the majority of Presbyterians, but several of its speakers, including Congressman Winslow, emphasized the desirability of a constructive program and of a little more zeal. I would just as lief trust my watch or my life to the 700 Unitarians whom I saw assembled in Tremont Temple the other evening as I would to the good Presbyterians whom I met at Rochester a night or two before. These Unitarians had come from all parts of the country and they didn't act or look like people who were disposed to give up either their name or their identity. They have certainly made great corporate strides since Dr. Samuel A. Eliot took the presidency of their Asosciation fifteen years ago, and the tributes paid to him for his initiative and sagacity were hearty, sincere and merited. In the item of trust funds he has our Dr. Herring beaten to a frazzle since the Association now has between two and three million dollars worth of property. Like his distinguished father, the Ex-President of Harvard, the younger Eliot has a way of bringing things to pass. To introduce anything suggestive of machinery or solidarity into a group of churches as independent as the Unitarians are is an achievement, and to do this without

getting one's self badly disliked is a work of art. It must be hard for any one not to like the frank, alert, modest, high-minded, friendly man whom his intimates call "Sam" Eliot.—H. A. B.

NEW BOOKS.

CHURCH RECONSTRUCTION, *by Strayer.*

Rev. Dr. Paul M. Strayer has written in *The Reconstruction of the Church* (Macmillan, $1.50) a book worth wide reading among the many interested in church efficiency. Dr. Strayer while a firm believer in the larger possibilities of the organized church, maintains that it is not meeting its responsibilities but is suffering from a law of diminishing returns. A given number of units of effort bring less results than formerly. This, he claims, is due to the fact that the church work is not so organized as to meet modern conditions.

"The church to minister to the spiritual culture of its adherents," says Dr. Strayer, "must furnish means for the expression of the Christian feeling which it has cultivated, and must propagate Christian truth and win recruits for the Christian way." He thinks the present program of the church is adequate for Christian culture, but weak in furnishing means of expression and in propaganda. Believing that the time has come to throw off all fear except the fear of inefficiency, the author would ignore alike tradition and the fear of being charged with irreverence or sensationalism, measure every act of church work by the standards of efficiency and discard all unprofitable activities and adopt all that would best accomplish the ends in view. The Sunday evening service should be frankly a propaganda instrument and should be built accordingly, while the conventional prayer-meeting should be dropped as an activity which pays no profit above the cost to keep it going.

"With all the functions it has delegated to the school, hospital, fraternal order and charity organization," says Dr. Strayer, "the church as a social institution has left as its best opportunity to organize the leisure of the people * * * The trouble is right here: the people have forgotten how to amuse themselves, and amusement is supplied for them. The character of the amusement furnished may be good or bad, but the fact that it has to be furnished is bad."

The book has three parts: I. "A Revised Message for the Church of Today"; II. "The Church at the Parting of the Ways"; and III. "Reconstructing the Program." The author believes in and treats of church advertising, combining the rural churches, and the church as a recreational center.

EMERSON P. HARRIS.

Montclair, N. J.

In accordance with our established custom, there will be no issue of the UNITARIAN ADVANCE *for August. The address of the Editor for July and August will be Prospect Harbor, Maine.*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ON BILLY SUNDAY.

OF A recent sermon on "The Religion of Tomorrow" preached at the Church of the Messiah by Rev. John Haynes Holmes, the New York *Times* publishes the following excerpt:

"It is interesting to note that the Rev. 'Billy' Sunday who seems to hate Unitarians so cordially, is, as a matter of fact, one of the most ardent exponents of their interpretation of religion. Mr. Sunday's crusade has, of course, all the outward characteristics of the orthodox revivals of the past. All this, however, is merely on the surface. He who thinks that 'Billy' Sunday is a reincarnation of Whitefield or Evans, and this revival only a duplication on a somewhat larger and more vulgar scale of the great revivals of the past, is deceiving himself.

"The one thing which is most remarkable about this movement, to my mind, is the extraordinary fact that here, amid all these old-fashioned surroundings, there is being preached the new truth of modern liberalism—that religion finds its true expression in the moral life.

"'Billy' Sunday thinks he is absolutely faithful to the 'old-time religion.' Nothing would shock him more than to be told that he is a triumphant representative of that very Unitarianism which he attacks with such bitterness and hate. He uses all the old phrases, plays all the old tricks, handles all the old paraphernalia, and does it a little more effectively, perhaps, than it has ever been done before, but at the bottom his work, all the same, is not theology, not conversion, not faith in Christ as the Son of God, not acceptance of the Cross, but plain, matter of fact, everyday morality.

"The one thing that 'Billy' Sunday seems to be genuinely interested in is getting people to be decent. He ridicules, denounces, insults those who declare that conduct and character are the great things. He asserts with unexampled picturesqueness of phrase that belief in Christ and Him crucified is the only road to salvation, but all this seems to be mere sound and fury, signifying nothing.

"What he really cares about, as I have said, is to get people to be decent, to be good parents, to be honest citizens, to be clean in their personal life, to stop drinking, to cut out frivolity and selfish indulgence, to pay their bills, to care for their homes, to destroy the liquor traffic, to clean up the town.

"All this means that the Rev. 'Billy' Sunday is not orthodox at all. Judged from the old-time standpoint he is a heretic of the heretics. In spite of all his ignorance, shocking vulgarity, and wild denunciation of the advocates of liberalism, this man is himself a liberal and a standing proof of the fact that the old religon of faith is gone and the new religion of plain morality is come."

Positive Unitarianism

By Rev. Maxwell Savage,
Pastor of the Unitarian Church in Louisville, Ky.

WHAT is Unitarianism? To me it is an attitude of mind and heart, the same essentially throughout all the centuries, but different in its applications according to the knowledge of the generations as they pass.

From the beginning of history, as I know it, there has ever been the struggle between the religions of authority and the religion of the Spirit. These two tendencies, one to external authority and the other to the freeing of the internal spirit, you can follow from the time that Abraham, searching for a new and higher conception of God, walked out from the tent of his father and refused any longer to worship the idols of his forbears.

Once upon a time there was a certain nation—the Hebrew nation—which first rose to the thought of one God, but even after that nation attained to that point, the average worship of the average man was of a narrow God, a national figure, and the average worship of the average man in ancient Judea was given over to ceremonial, ritual, sacrifices. It was priestly instead of prophetic.

But the prophets arose from time to time, and they differed materially from these people of priestly minds. They worshipped a God and called the people's attention to him—a God that was international, wider than any one, narrow, sectarian conception, and these prophets by their very spirit were always non-conformists. They were always saying to the people, "God doesn't want you to worship him with sacrifices, with bare formulas and rituals. What he wants you to do is to worship him in such wise that you will learn to let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

Now after a time that nation came practically to an end—before the day of Jesus. Just a word here in passing as to that period between the Old and the New Testaments. Most people think it was a time when thought lay fallow. On the contrary, it was a time vital with all sorts of questionings. For the most part, however, men were still looking back, still hoping for a miracle, for it was a day of belief in signs and wonders, of great and deep superstition, as Jesus found when he came. Prophets of the Old Testament had struck ethical and spiritual notes which were ahead of their day; therefore they were for the most part either forgotten or ignored.

The thought of the people had not held true to the teaching of the prophets, but it had been colored, and in some instances discolored, by Oriental beliefs and Greek philosophy. So there were many different ideas brought in by these new philosophies and questionings and theologies—new schemes of salvation being thought up during this period just before the coming of Jesus.

The distinctive teachings of the prophets had become overlaid with ritualism, tradition, superstition, priestly theories, and the great mass of the people were searching for the letter of the law, having forgotten the spirit of religion which ever grows better and better.

Then onto such a stage as this came Jesus, the Nazarene. The people of his day were all on tiptoe looking for a Messiah who was to bring them back the kingdom of David, a Messiah who was to give them a materialistic kingdom, gold and territory. Jesus did not give them that, so he was rejected, but he went about over the country and on the first Palm Sunday he came to Jerusalem. He went through the small outlying towns, teaching a new ideal of God and man, preaching in the synagogues, and finding in these synagogues the scribes who were attached thereto, and whose office was simply to interpret the Old Testament law in the light of the past.

So Jesus came, towering morally and spiritually above his day, teaching no "religion of authority," but exemplifying in his words and in his life the religion of the spirit. He found the people gathered about the broken cisterns that could hold no living water, and he pointed to them the fountainhead whence com-

eth the living water which slakes all human thirst.

Now what were his teachings? To sum up for a moment in passing: first, the fatherhood of God, a universal and spiritual conception; second, the brotherhood of man, not the brotherhood of Jews but the brotherhood of all men, a universal, international idea. He taught the value of this human nature of ours. He taught the leadership of God. He said, "Call ME not good," and he said again, "Greater are to come after me." I do not believe that Jesus ever for one moment claimed to be God. I wish you would all read Emerson's Address to the Senior Class in Divinity College, Cambridge, in which he points out that there came this man with teachings so far ahead of his day that he was misunderstood. He said, "I am divine; yea, all men are divine," but the Church that came after him narrowed him down, and within three hundred years that Church had power to back up its words, "He is a God, and if you say he was a man, I will kill you."

I do not believe that Jesus ever claimed to be the Messiah in the popularly conceived idea of that term, and that's why I wish that the membership of this church would change its name to the First Unitarian Church of Louisville.

His salvation—what did he teach for salvation? He had no scheme of theology in the general conception of the word. His salvation is to be found in the "Prodigal Son." The son—man—goes astray, and after a time he wants to go home to the Father. Does Jesus say to any man, "You must be baptized," or "You must believe in me crucified," or tell him that he must join any certain church, or believe in any infallible book? No! The son goes home, and the Father is glad. He allows no mediator between him and his son, but he meets him more than half way on the homeward path.

In this connection let me say that Jesus never mentioned Adam, nor the Fall, nor the result of that Fall, and to me, for one, it is rather strange, if his main reason for coming were to save men from this result, that he never mentioned it once in his years on earth. He did not lay stress on rites or creeds, but on character. He taught men to build this character through spiritual worship and human service.

So Jesus taught, and was killed. Twenty years after he died the next great figure of the progressive spirit, of this tendency toward the higher and the better, Paul, stood forth, Paul, second only to Jesus in Christianity. In fact as far as his influence is concerned upon the popular mind, he stands ahead of Jesus. Paul saw that the Jewish followers of Jesus were trying to make his religion a little narrow Judeaic concern, a national thing, and standing against this idea he split with the apostles. He felt that this new dispensation must be for all men, for Jew and Gentile, for Greek and Roman, for civilized man, and for barbarian, and thus he stood for the progressive heretical tendency of his day in this Unitarian attitude of mind and heart.

Peter stood for the past, for the narrow, national religion of his fathers. Now to understand Paul we must understand the theory that he held. He was brought up in the Greek school at Tarsus, and seems to have reflected gnostic thought. Also, remember this in passing, his world was not our world. It was a three-story affair, the earth flat, Heaven just up there, and Hell down below. Paul held the belief that Adam was the first man, and that he sinned and fell. Then all humanity under the leadership of Adam had been an utter failure, until God sent an Angel-Messiah, a pre-existent creature, "the word made flesh," to redeem humanity from the results of the fall. So Christ came, and all men who believed in this Christ were justified by faith, and belonged to the new dispensation, wherein "all men are made alive." Right in there can be found one seed of the "governmental theory" of salvation which is the great orthodox theory of today.

Mr. Sunday and Mr. Moody, and many other men have said, and said consistently, with the premise of orthodoxy, that it doesn't make any difference how good you are. Unless you get up and acknowledge Christ crucified you are damned. What is the governmental theory? Supposing the state of Kentucky should tomorrow rebel against Washington—should secede from the Union, and I should join with the opposing forces. The Government of Washington wouldn't care a bit as to whether I was

a good husband, or a good father or a good citizen of this town, but if they could kill me they would. It wouldn't make any difference about my morals. Now if I should go over to "the powers that be," to the Government at Washington, they wouldn't ask me anything about my morals, but I should belong to the army of the government. That's like the old story of salvation, and one seed of it lay in Paul's teaching, though he never intended that it should grow in that direction or bear such fruit.

Paul never mentioned any virgin birth. It had not become a belief at his time, and he shared the common idea of the time, that Jesus was not God.

Now after Paul churches began to spread, because he had made his teaching wide enough to include all peoples and not Jews alone. These churches spread over the Roman Empire until at last they became The Church in the year 325 at the council at Nicaea. At that council there were two opposing forces, the old tendency as against the new. Athanasius stood for the Trinity, and held the reactionary idea of religion, that the churches should be simply cisterns holding the ancient waters of the spirit of the past. Opposed to him was Arius, teaching what I have called the Unitarian tendency of heart and mind, striving to keep the waters of the spirit running clear from the fountainhead. But Arius was beaten in the council which was carried on with tactics that would shame even a Tammany political gathering today, and he and his followers were driven forth and hounded. Then the Church, the receptacle of the beliefs of the past, became more and more a worldly power. Here and there some Saint Francis with the spirit of Jesus arose, but it was like a flash in the dark. And so at last Rome became a new, worse Judeaism, and spiritually dead.

Then Luther arose, and in the light of the spirit of Jesus gave the impulse of his personality to the world; but all through these centuries up to the time of Luther this Unitarian tendency of thought was moving along, underground for the most part, now and then rising to the surface only to be driven back underground by the religious intolerance, the cruelty and the hatred of the time, and then arising again at some point further on in history.

A good illustration of this movement are the California rivers that I have seen so often, starting in the mountains, flowing freely from the fountainhead, striking the dry, barren, unwelcome, sandy deserts, sinking, flowing underground, coming up here and there in waterholes, running a few hundred yards, driven underground again by the heat of the sun, until at last they gush out somewhere, where the land is favorable and flow freely on the surface to the sea. That is the way it has been with progressive thought and attitude in the past, up through the ages more and more frequently rising to the surface, until during the last hundred years or so it has been allowed to flow freely on the surface, gaining in power and strength. You can parallel this tendency in religion with the same tendency in civil government.

Can you imagine a Thomas Jefferson, with his democratic ideas, having been allowed to teach them in the day of Jesus? But little by little up the ages as the spirit of democracy has spread in the world, the river has flowed more and more on the surface and today is there to stay.

So Luther came, teaching the individual right to think in religion. He opened the Bible for people to read. He drove the wedge of reason into the Bible. He said, "Here it is; it has been a closed book to you, now read it." And friends, that wedge is going on until it goes *through,* in spite of the people of the orthodox protestant world, who are false to Luther himself. But Luther made one mistake. He stepped from an infallible church to an infallible Book. It was his contemporary, a Unitarian, Francis David, from the little town of Kolozsvar in Hungary, who pointed out that if there were to be a true reformation this spirit of reform, this spirit of progress, must be kept. It must not be allowed to crystallize again about a book as it had crystallized in the past about a church.

So because of the opening of the Bible, because of such men as Francis David, in spite of religious intolerance, in spite of the torch and the sword and the rack, Unitarianism rose oftener to the surface and remained longer. Strange to say, it first arose in Spain and in Italy, and because its champions were so close to the mailed fist of Rome, they were

driven out, and traveled north where they found shelter in the valleys of Switzerland and elsewhere. Then it rose in Holland, a country that has always welcomed liberal ideas. It rose in England under the free institutions of that country and was seen for a time in the people's church in London. It rose in Poland, existed especially among the nobility, but was crushed out. It rose in Hungary and existed among the nobility and the peasants, and is there in force to this day.

Come now to our own country—to the Puritans and Pilgrims. The Puritans came here not for religious liberty; they came to set up a theocracy, and those who could not agree with them in religion could not vote in their towns. They were driven out. The Puritans were illiberal. They were gathering about the broken cisterns again. The Pilgrims did come for religious liberty, not only for themselves but for anybody who might differ from them. The Pilgrims in the cabin of the Mayflower drew up the first covenant that the world has ever known. They said, "We will walk in all God's ways which have been made known to us, and which *shall be* made known to us," leaving the front door open for new truth as it becomes revealed, day after day.

Then take the hundred years before the revolution, a time seething in controversy between two tendencies, one to Calvinism and Puritanism, the other to Jesus and the free spirit of the Pilgrims. After the revolution most of the great men of New England were Unitarians. Harvard College became Unitarian the first of the nineteenth century, and this helped cause a split among the Congregationalist churches of New England. Those that are still called Congregational stepped back to Calvinism, and those that are called Unitarian, as the old Plymouth Rock Church is called in Plymouth, stood by the open covenant of the Pilgrim Fathers.

Then came Channing, teaching for the first time in this country in his Baltimore sermon the humanity of God and the divinity of man. I heard somebody say the other day that he was conservative. He was so radical that there was strong disagreement between him and his own church most of his days.

Then came Emerson with his Cambridge address. Emerson called miracles, as popularly understood, "monster." He was so radical that he left his Unitarian pulpit because it was not free enough for him.

After him came Theodore Parker, driven out by the spirit that would gather about the broken cisterns, driven out from the Unitarian churches of Boston, having to preach in Music Hall. Why? Because he believed that God was lawful, and he refused to believe in the miracles —and I do not know of any live Unitarians today that believe in them.

Then came Evolution.

If you will forgive me for the personal words, it was my father who alone first joined the hands of Evolution and Religion in the pulpit, and he, in Boston, was at first ostracized for it. After twenty years of fighting, almost alone, for this interpretation of religion in the light of evolution, Harvard gave him his honorary degree, and all the live Unitarians were preaching what he had preached, and still are.

So this tendency comes onward and upward a tendency of heart and mind, changing only in that it adapts itself to the new revelations of truth as they appear, age after age.

And now come to today.

This generation of ours can be well compared to the generation before Jesus. Many people are tending toward revivalism, looking for signs and wonders. Others—a few—are seeking for a new dispensation. Again, the Unitarians of today can be compared to Paul, who was looked upon as a heretic. Orthodoxy today can be compared to Peter and James, who stood for a narrow, exclusive idea in religion.

A theology is dying, but religion is immortal.

Again and again theologies have died. I suppose that in ancient Greece when Socrates pushed the gods off Olympus people said, "Religion is dying," just as they do today. No, a theology is dying; religion is growing more and more perfect toward the perfect day. But what do I mean when I say that religion is dying? And I hope I won't shock any of you by this. The old "governmental theory" of salvation is going. The keystone of the arch of orthodoxy is the Fall of Man. That arch has been so perfectly built to the keystone that when the

keystone goes it must necessarily collapse. Take away the Fall of Man and there is no reason for God's anger with his children. Therefore, the old idea of Hell goes. If God is not angry with his children, there is no need of a supernatural Savior coming to save them from the results of a fall that never was. There is no need of the "atonement." There is no need of a virgin birth to set this supernatural Savior apart from the rest of us. There is no need of an infallible Bible to set forth this special scheme of salvation. There is no need of an infallible church or a supernatural Church, with a capital C in it, which you must get into to be saved. And so I say that with the going of the keystone it is *all* gone. And today, as never before since the day of Luther, it is either Rome or reason. I know priests, good friends of mine, who agree with me on just that point, that it is either blind faith in external authority, or it is the kind of open-eyed faith that goes as far as it can with reason and then dreams out beyond, but in line with, reason. It's either priest or prophet. It's either undemocratic authority, or it is the spirit of democracy in religion.

So we see at this time numbers of people unchurched, and I say "It is well!" I am glad that there is a spirit awake in the world that will make men question, that will make them willing to go out from the churches of their fathers and find God through doubting! These seekers, constantly increasing in numbers, are walking along the path at the side of the road of life, asking questions, thinking things out for themselves, and then they discover a Unitarian church. They say to me, "Why I never knew that there was a church that stood for what I have thought out as an individual." I have had eight people say that to me in the last two weeks, and the shame on us is that we make them discover us; that we haven't more of the missionary spirit to spread the thought that God *is* and not *was*; that one can be awake and believe today, and still be religious. Everywhere there are people thinking it out for themselves.

I like to divide humanity horizontally rather than perpendicularly. People who have, through a little thought, through a little affection, grown up to a certain attitude of mind and heart all over the world. I met thousands of them four years ago in Berlin—men from India, men from Germany, men from France, men from England, men from Japan, from all over the world. These liberal thinkers are trying to be true to the fountainhead and to break away from the broken cisterns. So to counteract this growing modernism in the world, we find these revivals spreading today.

I believe the orthodox churches are deserting rationalism and turning to emotion. I am reminded, when I read of these revivals, of the statement attributed to ex-President Eliot, when somebody said that Unitarians were rather cool, that he preferred a natural warmth to an artificial heat.

Now as to these revivals and this singing "The old-time religion is good enough for me." It may be good enough for some, but it is not good enough for a growing number of untold thousands of people in the world; not good enough for the boys and girls that are going to school, and are thinking for themselves. These revivals are simply a galvanizing of something that is dying, and the more decent thing to do is to let it die. These revivals are but temporary spasms. Consistent orthodoxy cannot stand before the steady growth of reason, common sense, sympathy and the spiritual religion of Jesus. Therefore, why not—we of like attitude—get together and work as we should for the influencing and spreading of this new and finer, more hopeful, more Godlike Gospel in the world.

I often hear that Unitarianism is negative; that it is a denial. I say in reply that orthodoxy, when it is real, is the *Great Denial*. It denies the fatherhood God of Jesus. I was glad to see by the papers the other day that Mr. Sunday admits it. He wants the angry old God of the Old Testament orthodoxy. Consistent orthodoxy denies the brotherhood idea of man, for it denies divinity to all men except one who happened to live for a few years in a little place on the edge of the Mediterranean. It denies inspiration to all books but one. It denies the character idea of salvation. It denies Jesus, while it upholds the metaphysical Christ of Paul. It denies the evolutionary progress of humanity. It denies the evolutionary teachings that the children are getting in the public schools. I said to a man the other night who told me that he believed in the infallibility of the

Bible, "You had better take your children out of the public schools. They are learning evolution every day of their lives." Orthodoxy denies the lawful workings of God, in that it admits the possibility of miracle, of God contradicting himself, breaking his own laws if only some revivalist prays hard enough. It denies the universe as we understand it today. It denies the imminent God-Spirit to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, and still impresses on children the old idea of an angry man with a long beard, sitting off somewhere outside of his world.

I say that Unitarian affirmations uphold—are positive—affirm every single one of these things that orthodoxy denies. Some people say that we are too intellectual. You do have to do a little individual thinking, I admit, to get this attitude of mind and heart, but did you ever realize that all right actions are based upon sober, clear thinking?

Every religion is intellectual, but there are different grades of intellect. There are different qualities and quantities of intellect. So we see in the past three stages of popular religion: the first, reliance on ritual; second, reliance on belief; third, a coming reliance on service in the light of right thinking. The world during the last two thousand years has grown and it is growing toward the place where Jesus stood two thousand years ago; and so I say that the Unitarian attitude of mind and heart is coming into its own, that as Paul said to the people of his day (I quote the thought), "Neither you nor your fathers, if you are going to keep abreast of the time, can fulfill the law of Moses." So I say to you that if you are going to live in the twentieth century, mentally and morally, you cannot fulfill the law of orthodoxy, concerning creation, salvation and the destiny of man. So this Unitarian attitude of mind and heart is coming into its own in the light of evolution, in the light of education, in the light of democracy, in the light of common sense as applied to religion, and in the deepening and the widening of human sympathy which would include and not exclude any creature of God. The prophetic type in America, especially the land of Prophets, is winning, and the priestly type is losing, for more and more men say, "I want truth for authority and no longer do I want external authority for truth." More and more men are seeing that the great things of the world are the simple things, that the great men of history have been the simplifiers. We want to lay stress on the simple teachings of Jesus. Men grow tired of the complexities of belief that would divide humanity.

Now at the end, and I have talked a long time—the name. Be proud of the name Unitarian. It was thrust upon us in this country in the days of Channing, although it had been used in Hungary for hundreds of years. The name does not signify simply an intellectual stand against the trinity. The movement was a moral revolt in the day of Channing against the degrading and degraded Calvinistic ideas of God, and of the nature and destiny of man!

"Unity is the root of the name, as it is the root of the substance it stands for. The modern mind of man is building more and more on the unity of God, on the unity of humanity and on the unity between God and his child humanity, which Jesus taught. More and more the human mind is marvelling at the underlying unit of the universe. More and more religion is expressing itself as oneness of worship. Hold to unity with deep, religious, philosophic faith, and you will find yourself upheld. There is no other name that I know of that lends itself so well to the modern aspirations or to the larger tendencies of modern thought." Therefore, I ask you, I plead with you, to come together and stand fast in the freedom wherewith Jesus the Nazarene hath made us free, and do not, I beg of you, through carelessness or selfishness become entangled again in a yoke of bondage. The undemocratic forces in civic government and religion are always at work, for there ever exists a tendency in man to give up searching for the fountain-head and to gather about the broken cisterns of the past. But I ask you to seek for the springs, to realize that you will not find them by going across the seas, for they are not far from you—neither will you find them in the Heavens nor in the earth beneath, but they are near unto every one of you, just as the seed of the Kingdom of God is near to every one, nearer than hands and feet, to be found within yourself when you will free your hearts and your minds. So, at the end, what is Unitarian-

ism? We have five articles of a covenant the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the human leadership of Jesus, salvation by character, and the progress of mankind onward, upward forever; but that is not enough. These are mere words for many people. Unitarianism is Democracy in Religion. Unitarianism is this attitude of mind and heart that leaves the front door open for the rising of tomorrow's sun that the light of the new day may come in. It is an attitude of mind and heart because of which, and not in spite of which, you can live and grow and have your being in the twentieth century. But it is not an attitude just to be struck. Don't strike the attitude and think that you can hold it. It is an attitude that can be kept only by putting the heart and mind to work, searching and striving in the light of today to do the will of the Father.

Sin and Atonement

By Dr. Troward H. Marshall,

Unitarian Church, Dayton, Ohio.

"THE Indians of Guiana, before tempting to shoot a cataract for the first time, and in order to avert a possible evil, rub red pepper in their eyes. Among the Sioux, for like reason, it was the custom for warriors, in order to obtain the aid of the Great Spirit, to pierce their breasts, pass leather cords through, attach themselves to a red-painted post, and dance about it. Others would cut off little pieces of flesh from different parts of the body, offering these to the sun, the earth, and the cardinal points, to render the Manitous favorable. There is on record the cast of a Black Coyote Indian who, to avert further deaths in his family from an epidemic, cut seventy pieces of skin from his body.

To the ancient Babylonian, the world was peopled with hosts of spirits who had to be placated at every turn; most trivial and innocent mistakes involved expiation and atonement; a vast system of magic grew up, including baptisms and formal cursings; the evil would pass off from the sinner into the water; while the officiating priest conducted the ritual, the sinner would probably read his sins from a tablet, after which the tablet would be broken as a sign of the remission of sin.

The whole world, both ancient and modern, can provide us with endless instances of this effort to secure expiation and atonement. It is here with us, in our own lives, quite as much as among the Nyanza negroes. The little child offends against the parent; the millionaire offends against society; and it becomes both humorous and tragic to watch the efforts to regain right relations with the parent and with society.

There are human sacrifices, for this purpose of atonement, in Fair Arcadia up to the second century of our era; the Aztecs of Mexico had from 20,000 to 50,000 human sacrifices a year; in ancient Greece, initiates into the religious cult were baptized in the blood of a bull; Arabians on the desert sands sacrificed their animals, with rites that are surviving even in our midst; in ancient Denmark living human beings were walled up in castles, to appease the gods; Tacitus tells of human sacrifices among the Teutonic tribes; among some peoples the firstborn must be sacrificed; not far from Dayton a short time ago a woman was seen to read her Bible during a thunderstorm, under the conviction that lightning will never strike a house where the Bible is being read.

Mystical powers are held to reside in blood. It is mentioned not only in our own hymns here in America, but forms a strong motive among the cruder peoples. Chinese people, in times of pestilence, will place magical sentences on their door-posts, written in blood; the skeletons of Ashanti kings are washed with blood; the Koran says that God created man out of clotted blood; there is an authentic story of an Arab, newly married, atttacked when with his wife. He killed her, smeared himself with her blood, fought till he fell, by this means uniting her soul with his own.

What has the modern mind to say

about the whole cycle of ideas represented by the words: Expiation, propitiation, atonement, sacrifice?

No answer of value can be secured until you decide how you are going to think of man and of God. Is the world, for you, peopled with spirits, spooks, hobgoblins, devils of all kinds? Then perhaps it would be well to restore the full Babylonian cult and ritual. Is God a vindictive Lord, ruler of the lesser spirits hovering about us? Then we had better return to the rites of the negroes on the banks of the Congo. Is humanity alien from the life of God, a set of beings with whom he can make sport? Then we might well play the game of many primitive peoples.

But no! We look out with new eyes upon life, upon the world, upon humanity, upon God. How should we view humanity? Look at the baby, and see! There it is, a plastic little creature, which must grow, through the discipline of the years, to vigorous manhood and winsome womanhood. What can you do for it? Very little. Hands off! Mould it too strongly, and it becomes a namby-pamby weakling; fail to mould it at all, and it becomes a wayward, primitive savage again, losing all the heritage of centuries of cultivation. That baby, then, is a thing which has to grow, and there can be no artificial short-cut to its manhood. So with humanity. It is still in its early youth. Out of a long infancy it has come, and into the longer discipline and effort of a toilsome youth it now enters. Humanity, judged by its crudities and imperfections, is of little worth, indeed. But, like a baby, judged by its possibilities, its efforts, it is of infinite worth.

It would be well to ask: "What does God think of us?" Does he say: "One day, out on my travels, I met this strange people on the earth. I will now make sport with them?" Then, in such case, we had better restore primitive magic, to fool him, and make him favorable. Or does he say: "I created these people. I made them, in order to exhibit my immutable justice?" Then we must restore all the judicial terms—God the judge; man the suppliant. Or, lastly, does God say: "I am this people; I am much more than they; but they are bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh; in them I strive; through them I agonize and suffer; through them, in the eternal process of the years, I shall win, in my own due time, the perfect triumph of my boundless love?"

In this third way we must think of God, so I believe. "He is everlastingly, at the cost of his own effort, and his own pain, redeeming and perfecting the world he made." "In all their afflictions he is afflicted."

"I think this is the authentic sign and seal,
Of Godship, that it ever waxes glad,
And more glad, until gladness blossoms, bursts,
Into a rage to suffer for mankind."

Yes, the sages are right. The moral human being is deeply conscious of imperfection in his life. What can be done about it? The truly modern person is not likely to revive primitive rites, nor to be content with the surviving remnants of those. What shall the modern person do? The thing he is most unwilling to do! He must repent. "There is nothing that can withstand repentance," said the great Jewish theologian, Maimondes. Job, Peter, Paul, Augustine, Oscar Wilde these classic figures in the field of repentance teach us the use of sackcloth and ashes. All great literature, from the "Oedius" of Sophocles, down to "The Scarlet Letter" of Hawthorne, and "Resurrection" of Tolstoi, teach us that repentance is a comely thing.

We cowards seek some magical atonement whereby all the effects of our past misdeeds can be blotted out. There is no such agency. In our bodies, and in our faces, and in our souls, the scars are likely to remain. If I have sinned, I need not sacrifice a lamb or a goat; for there is no God to smell the sacrifice. I need present no gift at the altar, for that is only an external attempt to make an angry being favorable, and, presumably God doesn't get mad at us. He doesn't ask for a propitiation, if he be the God we have earlier described. No! all we have to do is: Repent, quit the evil course, and expose our souls to the healing forces of life and society.

But that is not all. We have been talking about the individual, and perhaps most of our religious talk is vicious, because so largely conceived in terms of the

individual. A brilliant French anthropologist has said: "The individual is nothing, at the most, a madman." Society brings us into existence. All our assets are social, from our clothes to our beliefs. And sin is social. No individual entirely of himself commits a sin. Society, to an extent hard in each case to determine, is implicated in every sin.

Grant that we so taught children, so gave them ideals of life, that they would see the follies of fashion, the disasters of dissipation, the curse of envy and pride and lust; grant that the conviction were burned into the soul of each child, that all life must be lived in terms of a definite contribution to society and to the world's work, how much sin would be left?

Perhaps the highest word of the modern mind, regarding this classic problem of sin and atonement, is this:

"Be humble! realize your pettiness, your relative unimportance! Repent of what you have done! Get busy—not at the saving of your own petty soul—but get busy at the redemption of the world; make a unique contribution to the progress of the day; serve your own day and age with utmost abandon, forgetting your petty self in the larger social task; in this way, all mysteriously, your life shall become sweet and winsome; in this way, too, you shall serve best, and please best, that God who is within humanity, adopting all its struggles and triumphs as his own."

The Modern Church and Social Justice

Conducted By John Haynes Holmes.

IF IN WAR, WHY NOT IN PEACE?

AMAZING things are being done these days in England under the stress and strain of the nation's struggle for existence.

Within a few hours of the outbreak of the conflict against Germany, we were startled to see the government breaking right into the hitherto sacrosanct realm of buying and selling for private profit, with an official decree naming the market price of all ordinary commodities. Bread, meat, fish, potatoes, salt, coal, oil, cotton cloth—all these and many other articles of merchandise were priced at a certain definite maximum figure, and to this no tradesman in the Kingdom was allowed to add so much as a copper ha' penny. And so important to the welfare of the people did the Cabinet regard the control of the sugar supply, that every pound of this staple article was immediately appropriated by the government, and all imports seized at the port of entry. Whether this interference on the part of the government with the retail business of the community has been continued down to the present time, I have not been able to ascertain. Reports which have been reaching this country, from various sources in England, of mounting prices with resulting labor agitations for higher wages, would seem to imply that affairs had gone back again to the previous condition of unrestrained mercantile buccaneering. But that the government, for a time at least, found the ways and means of taking over into its own hands a large part of the business of the Kingdom, for the sake of guarding the public welfare, is beyond question. The general interest of the social whole so far transcended at the moment the specific interest of any particular individual, that such action seemed imperative and therefore became upon the instant possible!

At the same time, and for the same reason, that this revolutionary action was taken in regard to the food supply, similar action was taken in regard to the railroads. Within a few hours after the declaration of war, the control of every railroad in the United Kingdom was passed over into the hands of the government, and there it still remains. In such a crisis, private management of these public utilities could not be trusted to serve the nation as it had to be served if its welfare was to be properly conserved. Therefore, without even so much as a "by your leave," private ownership was to all intents and purposes ended in a single night, and public ownership begun. It has been stated that, as

soon as peace has been won, the railroad properties will straightway be returned to their former owners. But that such a reversion to old conditions will be tolerated by the English people is to the last degree improbable.

A third astonishing event came to pass in March, when Parliament passed without opposition, and almost without discussion, a bill empowering the government to seize without warning and to operate without let or hindrance any manufacturing plant wnich was deemed essential to the security of the Empire. This revolutionary piece of legislation was of course aimed at those various industries of one kind and another upon which the government is dependent for an adequate supply of munitions of war. Recurring troubles with employes over questions of wages and hours, unsatisfactory quantity and quality of production, disturbing reports of huge profits exacted of the government by private manufacturers—these were some of the conditions which seemed to make drastic action necessary, if England was not to fail for sheer lack of shoes, clothing, food, guns and ammunitions for her soldiers. But the reasons for this legislation are far less interesting, to us at least, than the legislation itself. Here, in the space of a single night so to speak, was it solemnly decreed that there was no factory or machine in the Kingdom of which any man had an ownership which the government was bound to respect. The right of eminent domain, so this action implied, must be taken to cover not only the earth which God has made, but the manufactures which some man has made by his skill, foresight, courage, inventive genius, money hazard! What the government wants, in other words, or thinks it wants, that, it will henceforth take. For the life of the nation is at stake! The public welfare is in direst peril! Labor disputes, competitive standards of manufacture, excessive profits—these may be endured perhaps in the happy times of peace, but cannot be endured now! They threaten the security of the realm, and therefore must they be wiped away by however arbitrary an act of government! Was there ever a more sweeping example of social authority than this—ever a more arrogant defiance of traditional liberties?

Still later came the agitation of the liquor question. On March 29th there waited upon Mr. Lloyd George, a deputation of the Shipbuilding Employers Association, the members of which were unanimous in urging that "in order to meet the national requirements at the present time," there should be a total prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. It was pointed out that the excessive drinking habits of the laboring classes were seriously interfering with the amount and quality of the work which was being done in the English ship-yards, and that unless the effects of this practise were in some way counteracted by government action, the interests of the nation would suffer irreparably. The example of Russia in abolishing the sale of vodka and of France in banishing absinthe were cited as wise precedent to be followed by England. To this appeal the reply of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was most emphatic. "We are fighting Germany, Austria, and drink," he said, "and, so far as I can see, the greatest of these three deadly foes is drink. I have a growing conviction, based on accumulating evidence," he continued, "that nothing but root and branch methods would be of the slightest avail in fighting with this evil. I believe that this is the general feeling, and if we are to settle with German militarism, we must first of all settle with the drink problem." And he ended with a promise to lay the whole matter before the Cabinet, with a recommendation for action. What steps will be taken as a result of this agitation have not yet been disclosed; but that the government can and will, if it so decides, shut up every saloon in the British Isles and thus destroy the liquor business at a single stroke, no one for a moment thinks of questioning!

Such action as this which is illustrated by these occurrences just recorded is most remarkable, as I have said. And yet such action is the commonplace of the times not only in England but in every country which is engaged in the Great War. I have already referred to the action of Russia and France in suppressing the sale of certain alcoholic beverages. The taking over of the railroads, whether private or public, for the exclusive use of the government in shifting troops, transporting supplies, etc., is a daily event on every battle-front on the continent. Germany has surpassed all other nations

in the extension of governmental control of national resources by seizing the whole food supply of the Empire, appropriating private bank deposits for public uses, and submitting to police regulation in city and town every necessary detail of the every-day lives of her citizens. And lastly, as the crowning instance of the supreme power of the state in such a crisis, of course, is the conscription of every able-bodied citizen for active service in the army. Not only has a man no right even to property in these days, but no right even to life, liberty, or happiness. His body and soul, as well as his business, home and fortune, belong to the state, and are to be used by the state for its own purposes as the officers of the state may in their best wisdom determine. Society is everything—the individual nothing. Or the individual is something only to the extent that he is contributing to social ends.

Such is the domination of public authority over private interest in the war-ridden countries of Europe today. And we accept it all as so natural, so inevitable, so much a matter of course, that we scarcely think it worth while to note and record what is taking place, as I am trying to do in this brief article! It is only proper, we say, when the welfare and indeed the very existence of the nation is at stake, that everything should give way to the public interest. There are most certainly no privileges, or even rights of any single individual, which the state is bound to respect at such a time. What society needs for its prosperity, its security, its life, that society must have, no matter what the cost to the private individuals or organizations adversely affected. There is probably no country in the world where the abstract doctrine of individual rights is more generally recognized and more widely put into practise than here in the United States. And yet, if war should break out tomorrow between America and Germany or Japan or Mexico, our government would forthwith proceed to do all that is now being done by the various nations struggling for world-mastery in Europe. Just such things indeed were done repeatedly during the four years of the Civil War. Abraham Lincoln was undoubtedly the most democratic of presidents, and yet he never hesitated to seize property without due process of law, make arbitrary arrests, ignore or defy the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus,* abridge the freedom of speech and press, and draft men into the army when men were needed. No ruler in history ever arrogated to himself under plea of necessity, more arbitrary power than that wielded by the immortal martyr president. James Ford Rhodes, in his *History of the United States Since 1850,* speaks of "the wholesale violations of personal liberty by our government" at this time. But full justification for this policy is usually assumed without question by historians.

What we have here, after all, in such practises as these, is a definite and deliberate mobilization of the material and human resources of society for its own immediate security and ultimate well-being. To do what must be done—to use what must be used—in order to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, this is the recognized social duty of the state in time of war!

But if in time of war, why not also, may we ask, in time of peace? Foreign invasion is not the only peril threatening the safety and even permanancy of a nation's life. The enemy from abroad is not the only foe of "the general welfare" to be resisted. The sword, the gun, the submarine, the dreadnaught, are not the only weapons which can be used for the destruction of a great people. In hours of profoundest peace, when relations with other countries are most completely satisfactory, a nation may be in need of a defense more immediate and powerful than anything which would be required in case of armed assault. And in case of such need, why should not appropriate action be taken? If the government can determine prices, and, as in the case of sugar in England and of all food products in Germany, take over the control of markets altogether, when the shadow of war is on the land, why should it not do the same when, in the hey-day of peace, control of the out-put, speculation in the exchanges, conspiracy in restraint of trade, agreement on wholesale or retail prices, storage or even destruction of surplus products, combine to establish a system of commercial extortion little better than that of highway robbery or out-and-out piracy? If the government, as in England today, can take over the control and even ownership of private manu-

facturing plants in order to end labor disputes and to guarantee a high standard and an unfailing supply of commodities, why should it not do identically the same thing when a whole industry is prostrated as in Lawrence, Massachusetts in 1912, or a necessity of life cut off as in the Colorado coal fields in 1914? And as for the liquor traffic, why should any government need a war crisis to convince it of the peril to the nation's security which is involved in this wretched business and the necessity therefore of absolute prohibition? Why, the march of an invading army through the land could not be more devastating in many ways than the conditions of life and labor now forced upon great masses of our population by the uncontrolled excesses of big business and private manufacture. For what difference does it make whether a tribute is imposed upon a city by a German general or a Standard Oil magnate? How are we concerned whether starvation and misery come from the cossacks or from the exploiters of wage-labor? And how shall we choose between the closing of the anthracite coal-mines by "Divine-Right" Baer and his associates, and a blockade of our ports by a hostile fleet from over-seas? Peace hath its enormities no less than war! In times of peace, just as in times of war, the welfare of society is at stake—a nation's life is imperilled—a whole people is being plundered, ravaged and destroyed. And yet so blind are we to these equally dangerous though infinitely less dramatic enormities of peace, that we have not yet seen the imperative need, in this case as in the other, for social action!

Just here, to my mind, is the lesson for our day and generation! What we need to learn, in this and every other country, is the wisdom and right of mobilizing the material and human resources of a nation for defense against internal exploitations as well as against external aggression. Every day the country needs to be saved! Never for a moment is she free from her besetting foes! What can be done at an instant's notice and without question of authority when the menace of war is at our gates, must be done with the same promptitude and power at any time when the many menaces of peace are at our threshold. The fathers ordained and established the Constitution of America, so they said, in order to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare." In order to accomplish these ends, they did far more than merely give Congress the power "to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Primarily they constructed a great machinery of government for the service of "us (we), the people," in the peaceful areas of industry, arts, letters, and religion. And who can gainsay the assertion that it was the intention of these fathers of the Republic that all powers delegated to legislative, executive and judicial departments of government should be dedicated and used relentlessly to these great ends? War, like every evil, has its by-products of good; and one of these is most certainly its revelation to a society of the vast powers at its disposal for its own defense and advancement. Is it too much to hope that the revelation now vouchsafed in this hour of world-agony will be duly noted, and a new era of social control thereby at last attained!

Our Readers' Exchange

EQUAL FRANCHISE ONCE MORE.

To The Editor of the Unitarian Advance:

I admit being the "Somebody up in New England" who is so benighted as to disagree with your views on equal suffrage; but what I wrote was not carefully worded, for publication, but a hurried page to a personal friend. I had no thought of stirring into activity your gifts of sarcastic "rebuttal." If I am correct in understanding you to deny the large majority of women do not wish the right of suffrage, you are the first intelligent man I have heard deny this. Suffragists admit that they are in the

minority, very largely; and this is why they oppose any referendum of the question to women.

I have not opposed equal suffrage as an abstract question; but I have expressed the opinion that it never has done and never will do any good along the lines where "woman's influence" is supposed to be strongest. It would merely increase the burden and expense of the ballot, force the duty on a majority who do not desire it; and accomplish nothing of value. To my mind too many are permitted to vote now. Thousands of men should be denied the ballot because uneducated and unfit in other ways. But there seems no way to sift the wheat from the chaff, and the case would be the same with women voting. It is no sane argument to say that "the sort of men and women who count" make a different estimate. In voting "the sort of women who count" are every sort, and not only the kindred spirits that call at the minister's study to agree with him. This was illustrated in "Life" some months ago. The artist pictured a dear, old lady about to cast her first vote. As she lifts her eyes she beholds two vulgar, loud women of the road-house type who had just cast their ballots. "Oh," said the old lady, "do You vote, too?" At any rate equal franchise can never become an unmixed or an untainted blessing.

You cannot understand why I "happen to be a Unitarian" and still see this question without your finer vision. Well, it didn't happen. I was born so. All my family and its branches are and always have been ardent Unitarians. I believe a very large majority of Unitarian women are opposed to "votes for women." They so express themselves. Not long since in a near-by town I spoke on "The Charm of the Earth" as the starting point of a village improvement league. I was a guest at the home of a Unitarian minister. He is rather indifferent, but his wife is strongly opposed to equal suffrage—and she is an enthusiastic worker along civic lines of development. You know her well, my dear Editor, but I'll name no names.

The fact is, that the peril of the suffrage propaganda lies very much in its close relations, socialism and feminism. Not all suffragists are feminists or socialists, but all socialists and feminists are suffragists, and right in my own circle of experience I have seen enough of the mixture to know the ruin and wreckage that follow in their wake. Why take the risk?

Even if I am not a good Unitarian according to your lights, I decline to be turned over to your friend "Billy Sunday"—even with the endorsement the UNITARIAN ADVANCE gave him in a recent issue. I am "an old-fashioned Unitarian" brought up with a different feeling about Sunday—the day and the revivalist.

I do not go more deeply into the suffrage question, because there are no limits to the discussion. A thousand facts might be presented for and against. So what availeth it to cuss or dis-cuss so vexing a question F. A. W.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—"F. A. W." misses our point entirely. In his previous letter he found great reason for not approving of the Equal Franchise in the fact that the overwhelming majority of men and women—according to his estimate—were on the other side. "To my mind," he said, "it is only reasonable to admit that the majority is right." We insist that if that is sufficient reason for not being a "Suffragist," it is an equally good reason for not being a Unitarian. Billy Sunday always gets the big majorities—not we! Of course we do not concede that the "great majority" of either men or women are on the other side of the Equal Franchise question. That's a matter of difference of opinion between "F. A. W." and ourselves. Honestly, we are not willing to believe in the limitations of our friend's acquaintance with "intelligent men" which his letter suggests. Suffragists are not in the least given to admitting that they "are in the minority, very largely!" They have another very valid ground for opposing a so-called "referendum," which in mat- of fact would be in no efficient fact a referendum at all.

ALL the tendencies of our time to give children the right to have a great deal of their own way are good tendencies, if we will understand that their own way is of course the right way as certainly as a climbing vine follows the turn of the sun. All we have to do is carefully and patiently to open the right way for them wherever they turn.

ROBERT COLLYER.

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

Iowa.

Rev. Everett D. Martin has resigned the pastorate of the First Unitarian Church at Des Moines to accept the place of editorial writer for the *New York Globe*. The following resolutions were passed by the church at the meeting at which his resignation was read:

"Whereas, The Rev. Everett Dean Martin has tendered his resignation as our minister to be effective at once to accept work in another field, and

"Whereas, During the four years of his ministry our lives have been quickened, our membership has been largely increased, and our work in the community has been greatly strengthened by his influence and message, and

"Whereas, We sincerely regret the necessity of severing the close and happy relations which have marked his work among us, yet gladly consent to any step by him that will permit of a larger opportunity for usefulness and incidentally mark an advance for himself; therefore, be it

"Resolved, By the First Unitarian church of Des Moines, that the resignation of Mr. Martin is accepted as requested by him; that we hereby express to him and his family the great sense of loss that comes to us in so doing and that a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of this parish to him."

The Davenport Church held its 47th annual meeting on June 11th, re-electing the officers whose terms expired. Reports were submitted, showing all departments of the church in prosperous condition. The first Sunday in June was observed as Flower Sunday with christening service for children and reception of new members. On the 13th, Rev. A. M. Judy occupied the pulpit, Mr. Kyle preaching at Iowa City. The sermon subjects for the last two Sundays were:

"Be Good!—But What, Pray, is Good?"

"Why in the Lowlands?"

Chicago.

The First Church will continue its services through July. The following circular letter has been sent out to attendants at the summer school.

"Unitarian churches are free churches. They are therefore undogmatic, believing in the "right and duty of private judgment," holding "the attitude of the open mind," trusting thereby to further the knowledge of truth and to foster the quality of personal life.

Channing, one of the fathers of Unitarianism in America, said: "I desire to escape the narrow walls of a particular church, and to live under the open sky, in the broad light, looking far and wide, seeing with my own eyes, hearing with my own ears, and following truth meekly but resolutely, however arduous and solitary the path in which she leads."

During July Mr. Pulsford will speak on the following subjects, bearing directly on some of the conclusions which today result from freedom in matters of religion.

July 4th—"The Authority in Religion."
July 11th—"The New God."
July 18th—"Can We Believe in Prayer?"
July 25th—"The Art of Life."

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE, MAY, 1915.

In other sessions of our Conference we endeavor to reinforce our personal religious faith, to broaden our intellectual and spiritual horizons, and to apply the ideals and impulses of religion in the field of the tragic collisions of classes and of peoples which confront us today.

In this one session we concern ourselves with the organized work of our churches for the continuous furtherance of these great spiritual and practical ends; try to see where we have succeeded, where we have failed, and how we may profit by experience and more effectively do our work. The weakness or strength of the organization, the machinery, if you will, becomes important because these directly affect the power to advance the spiritual and practical ends which are sought. Therefore we need not apologize for a consideration of matters relating to organization. After six years of service your Secretary finds himself reconsidering very carefully the question of his specific duties and of the relation of his activities to the individual churches of the district and to the denomination at large.

These duties are nowhere explicitly set forth, these relations not clearly and authoritatively defined. They grow partly out of a theory and partly out of a condition; are deeply rooted in a temper prevalent in the churches of our faith and reveal much both of the strength and weakness of Unitarianism as an organized force. The theory is that of Congregationalism—that the individual churches are independent, autonomous and do not recognize any central governing body; the condition is that for purposes of united action (primarily for church extension), a central body is needed as the agent of the churches. Out of this need arose various missionary organizations. But certain services of a continuing central agent were necessary to the perpetuation and development of the churches already established, primarily for the training and certifying of men for the ministry, the issuing of printed literature and the like. The so-called missionary organizations being in the field, gradually all these services requiring a central avent were forced upon them and in some instances became their chief concern, it naturally being held more essential to maintain a vigorous life in existing institutions than to found new ones if resources of men and money were not sufficient for both ends. Today the major part of the activity of a'l our missionary bodies is concerned with maintaining, deepening and broadening the life of already established churches. This condition rather accurately reflects the condition in the individual churches. Generally speaking their main pur-

pose is *intensive* rather than extensive. Our ministers feel it is primarily their business not to create a great institution, but to help develop great souls, to cultivate a high quality of personal life. It has been the glory of Unitarianism that it has helped to produce a number of great personalities, out of all proportion to the number included in its membership. It has been its shame that our quickening message has been brought to so few. It is against this background that we have to consider the work of the Western Conference as expressed in the activities and relations of its Secretary, for they have grown out of this theory and this condition.

Every kind of work desired or supported by the churches of this Conference which requires a central agent and servant is naturally placed upon your Secretary, including a large portion of the duties in other churches assigned to presiding elders or bishops, but without the authority committed to these officials. Besides the specific acts which he performs, partly in and through these acts, he becomes a visible bond of union between the churches, personally known to them all, his characteristic message familiar to them. With growing knoweldge of the affairs of the individual churches, with larger knowledge of the impression of Unitarianism upon the life of the Middle West than any other one person, familiar with both the successes and the failures of our cause, sometimes with knowledge of the reasons therefor, his value to the churches rests rather more upon such power as he has to quicken in the churches he visits faith in their own mission than in his power persuasively to speak our message in places where it has never been heard. For this last function, while indeed a part of his duties, is only occasional, while the other duty and opportunity is ever with him. It is a high and difficult task to which you call a man, giving him large freedom, large responsibilities and a power sometimes dangerously large and sometimes curiously inadequate.

One of the Conference Directors recently asked "How is it possible to maintain courage and confidence under these conditions?" The answer is that the faith and confidence maintain your agent and not he them. He really believes in the immense value of just the contributions our outwardly weak and inefficient organization brings to the lives of individuals, to the life of a community and to the life of the nation; that it is worth while to pay a high price for spiritual freedom and for fellowship in devotion to ideals which is not the result of external coercion. Your Secretary desires no power in dealing with churches, save that which they are willing to grant as a result of their friendly trust in him based on first-hand acquaintance. It is his business not to command but to serve.

With this understanding of his duties your Secretary reports upon his work in the year just closed under two heads—"In the Field" and "At the Headquarters in Chicago."

In the Field.

As your agent in presenting the message of our faith he has delivered during the year just closed 96 sermons and addresses and has visited 35 churches in 13 states. This means that in some cases he has spoken half a dozen times in one church which seemed to need just the help he was able to give at the time.

The one bit of definite new work for the year was a visit to the Union Church at Griswold, Iowa, where a community of one thousand people is making an honest attempt to unite all its members in seeking the truth and in living the good life. The minister, around whom this movement had organized, Rev. Charles E. Luck, had laid down his pastorate. One of the officers of the church having heard of the strange people called "Unitarian" and of their freedom from bondage to creeds thought perhaps we might help them in their search for a minister. As a result of my visit and of a correspondence extending over several months, Rev. George T. Ashley, who had received fellowship in our ministry, took charge of the church at Griswold where he still continues. In its relations with other denominations this church found each one willing to help, but only in case it might have control. Manifestly such control is precisely the last thing desired or needed at Griswold. This church of its own free will has sent to our treasury a contribution of $25.00 as an expression of good-will and appreciation and has expressed a desire to have our representatives who come within reach of Griswold visit it.

With Rev. C. W. Reese of Alton your Secretary conducted a series of meetings at Shelbyville, Ill., where regular services have not been held for the past ten years. As a result of this visit arrangements were made by which Dr. Reese has since held services at Shelbyville twice a month, with encouraging attendance and local support, and with a growing promise that after a time weekly services with a resident minister may be resumed. I know of no other place where services have lapsed that a resumption of them would mean more for our cause than at Shelbyville. In this connection it may be well to state that your Secretary represented the Unitarian body at the Lithia Springs Chautauqua last summer, occupying the pulpit, delivering several lectures and conducting a course in "Nature Study." Mr. Reese is to be manager of the chautauqua session the coming summer and your Secretary will co-operate with him. It now looks probable that the work established and maintained for so many years by Rev. Jasper L. Douthit will not fail even when he departs from this life.

Owing to the energy of the Woman's Alliance, the church at Omaha at the beginning of 1915 resumed services in a modest way in a private house rented by the Alliance for the purpose. Mr. Weatherly of Lincoln, Neb., is preaching twice a month and lay services are conducted on alternate Sundays. Your Secretary was privileged to hold conferences with Mr. Weatherly and with the church group at Omaha, taking counsel concerning the more public movement in the fall.

As the result of a visit to Topeka, Kas., where services have not been held for several years, arrangements were made to have Mr.

Dansingberg of Kansas City hold a service two Sunday evenings each month. The attendance at these services has been encouraging and suggests a larger remnant of interest at Topeka than we had dared to hope for.

The departure of Rev. Edward Day from Wichita to take a post on the Pacific coast was the occasion of a visit to Wichita. Several days were spent at this point and lengthy counsel was taken with the Board of Trustees. As a result of these conferences the Wichita church arranged for a hearing of several candidates and has just called to its pulpit Rev. L. M. Birkhead, a young and vigorous leader, who has recently come to us from the Methodist Fellowship.

At Jackson, Mich., where the church after the sale of its building had been dormant for several years, there has arisen the possibility of a joint movement between the Universalists of Michigan and the Unitarians. The Unitarian side of this undertaking has been in the hands of officers of our Michigan State Conference, but your Secretary has been informed of every proposed action and has been in conference both with Mr. Loring and with the Jackson people. A series of Sunday services has been held at Jackson and certain tentative arrangements for further effort have been agreed upon. The church at Sheffield, Ill., has been without a regular pastor for more than two years. To hold the interest and to help maintain the organization your Secretary has thought best to hold service there as often as he was free to do so. He has taken part in the dedication of the beautiful new church building at Dayton, Ohio, and in installations at St. Cloud, Detroit and Toledo and appeared upon the program of the Southern Conference at Louisville, Ky.

At the Office.

At the office, perhaps the first activity outside the routine correspondence which should be mentioned is the duties of the Secretary in connection with the Unitarian Advance. Up to October, 1912, the Conference had its own publication which served as a medium of communication between the churches. At that time, in accordance with a vote of the Conference, it was merged with the Unitarian Advance. Under this merger the whole Board of our Conference paper was added to the Board of the Advance and the same amount of space for church news which we had used in our own publication was guaranteed to us. Accepting this union in good faith the pressure of circumstances made it seem wise, if not necessary, for the business management of the Advance to be put into the hands of your Secretary. While this seems to add to his work it does not really do so, since all the routine work of the bookkeeping and sending of notices and receipts is in the hands of the Headquarters Clerk. Your Secretary is relieved of many duties in gathering and editing copy and in reading proof which were his under the old regime, he now being responsible merely for the "Western Conference News" section in each issue of the Advance. Here we have an illustration of a relation which arises not out of a theory, but out of a condition. With a small constituency a large number of denominational publications is extravagant. Yet a Conference which has a paper with a regular and definite budget of church news cannot afford to give up that bond between its scattered churches. On the financial side it may be said that from January 1, 1914, to January 1, 1915, the receipts and expenditures of the Advance almost exactly balanced each other. All the work upon this paper, save that of the printer, is freely given. Constant accessions of new subscribers are imperative if the paper is to be self-supporting as each year brings a considerable number of discontinuances. Since the Editor of the Advance took a missionary post in Texas and the business office came to Chicago, there has been a considerable increase in the number of contributed articles by residents of our section. The Advance fairly claims the continued support and co-operation of the Conference and the support of the ministers and churches of our district, both because it gives each month news from the churches of the Conference and also because it offers a free forum for the expression of every phase of our Unitarian movement.

Next we might mention the intimate relations between the Chicago Headquarters and the American Unitarian Association. Your Secretary, while not the only, is the most important and continuous, agent of communication between the Association and the churches in this district which receive its aid.

Another function which makes the Secretary, although paid by you, the agent of the denomination at large is that of Chairman of the District Fellowship Committee and Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Fellowship Committee of the General Conference. This important duty again has been laid upon your Secretary, not upon any theory whatsoever, but as a natural result of the conditions which make him the one central agent in the district permanently employed in the common affairs of our churches. Inasmuch as a large per cent of ministers in charge of our churches have become such through the agency of the Fellowship Committee, it is easy to see how important this function is. This work makes heavy demands upon the time of your Secretary, both in the office and in the field, entailing a large correspondence and many personal interviews. More applicants are rejected or given leave to withdraw than are accepted.

In recent years it has also been necessary in a few cases to take serious measures against certain men who had legal standing in our ministry. Some of these matters which came up outside our district were brought to the attention of the Executive Committee and the weakness of our legal status in dealing with such cases was revealed to us. The commission appointed by the General Conference, including in its membership at least one lawyer and certain other laymen, is now preparing a report upon the proper method of procedure in such cases which will be presented at the meeting in San Francisco. It is because of the close connection with the general affairs of the denomination thus thrust upon him that your

Board of Directors has for several years past instructed your Secretary to attend as its delegate the sessions of the General Conference.

Many requests for information regarding Unitarianism and for Unitarian literature come to the Chicago Headquarters. Some of these are directed to the Secretary, some of them are not. Some entail correspondence, and some do not. But the distribution of literature from the Headquarters in the aggregate is very large and should be reported as a part of the work of the Conference. Again our relationship to the A. U. A. is very close. Possibly a third of our space and an equal amount of the time of the Headquarters Clerk are devoted to the business of the Religious Education Department of the Association and the sale of books. This measurably covers the different kinds of work performed through the Secretary and the Headquarters Clerk, Miss Scheible.

Mention should be made of three churches in which the Conference is especially interested. On Nov. 22, 1914, the beautiful new edifice of the Dayton church was dedicated, the meetings extending over two days, the church being crowded both morning and evening of the dedication day. This fruition of hopes was due to general support by the denomination extended through the American Unitarian Association, added to the efforts of the Dayton friends. The interest continued to grow during the year, about thirty new members being added to the list. With the entrance to the new building the attendance at the regular services greatly increased and within the year the membership of the Sunday school has more than doubled. Here is a definite missionary effort in which the Association and the Conference co-operated and where within five years a completed church organization with an adequate house of worship has been achieved.

The church at Youngstown, Ohio, another of our missionary churches, has had a change of ministers during the year, Rev. F. M. Bennett having been installed Nov. 1, 1914. Under the trained leadership of Mr. Bennett, the church is fast attaining a unity which it has never known before and its records show thirty-three and one-third per cent gain in membership and thirty per cent in financial strength.

The church at Oklahoma City stands in a somewhat peculiar relation to the Conference. The work there was originally started by the Secretary of this Conference. Two years ago after a period of slumber it was reawakened by your present Secretary and the aid granted to it has so far been credited to the Western budget. Geographically, however, this church belongs to the Southern Conference, and since a minister has been in charge, your Secretary has not visited this place and has recommended that next year the aid granted be put into the Southern budget rather than the Western. Yet our relation is such that we follow with interest the work at this point and rejoice in the fact that it has been maintained and has even made advances through an unusually protracted period of financial depression. We have to record the departure of Rev. C. J. Harris, who has been in charge for the past two years, and the coming of Rev. C. S. Bodwell, who took charge a month ago.

The church at Madison, Wis., has been offered a further gift by its generous benefactor, Dr. Vilas, a corner lot 50 by 90 feet in the best part of the city, valued at $7,500 on which a parsonage is later to be erected.

There have been relatively few changes in the leadership of our churches during the current year. On October 11th, Rev. Walter A. Smith was installed at St. Cloud, Minn.; in November, Rev. J. A. Kyle took charge of the church at Davenport, Iowa; and Rev. Newton B. Knapp of the church at Hinsdale; on January 1st, Rev. W. L. McKinney took charge of the church at Geneseo and on February 27th, Rev. F. J. Gauld was installed as pastor of the church at Toledo.

On the whole our city churches seem to maintain themselves more strongly and to make gains more consistently than the churches in smaller communities. The totals for some fifty churches are as follows: Gross gain in members for the year, 607; losses by death and removals, 125; leaving a net gain in membership for the year of 482. While these figures are small they do show that in this district, in proportion to the number of members, our church is gaining in quite as rapid a ratio as most churches of Evangelical name. Indeed, it seems as if our churches are as able as any others to make these relative gains wherever the minister and people really think it is important to strive for them.

Taking the Conference as a whole there seems to be a definite gain in missionary impulse which has produced significant results in enlarging the membership of certain churches. This impulse expresses itself in three distinct ways:

First, in a new enthusiasm for Religious Education and a new interest in youth. Many of our churches are as yet untouched by this spirit, but those where it has been at work for several years consecutively begin to show significant results.

Second, in a growing but not new interest in the common welfare. This interest expresses itself in a great variety of ways, ranging from the support of a Mission Free School, a heritage from a past generation to the action of another church last winter in housing and feeding for several months several hundred men who were out of work; from forums for the discussion of pressing social problems to leadership of a "clean-up" crusade which found its climax in the driving out of a corrupt city government and the installing of a new administration pledged to the enforcement of the laws.

Third, in a definite movement for increasing the membership and the effectiveness of the local church. In one church this was known as the "get one" movement, the idea being for each member to secure a new member. In another church an individual layman, impressed by the message from the pulpit, gave a sum of money to be used def-

initely for advertising the services of the church. At another point a group of men made themselves responsible financially and personally for a publicity campaign which had a marked influence upon the attendance. In all these cases there was a genuine and hearty conviction that to increase the attendance and get new members was a fine thing to do. To get new members just to help pay the bills is ignoble. May we never reach after recruits in that spirit. To secure new members that they may gain clearer vision and enjoy quickening fellowship, or that they and we together may achieve larger personal and social ends is altogether good. As this spirit spreads in our churches we may expect even more significant gains than those shown by the reports of this year.

At the last annual meeting your Board of Directors made two recommendations. First, that a systematic attempt be made to increase the Endowment Fund of the Conference to $50,000. Owing to the disturbed financial conditions of the current year no definite effort has been made to carry out this recommendation. Your Board still believes the recommendation wise and again offers it for your consideration and action.

Second, they recommended the assumption of larger responsibilities by the Conference, the particulars of which were duly set forth, the proposition being identified by the title "Conference autonomy." On an informal ballot there was a considerable majority in favor of the proposed change of relations with the A. U. A. It was, however, felt that there should be practical unanimity if such a change were to be made and the proposals were referred to the churches whose action was not to be final, but for the information of the Board. The number of responses received was disappointing. Many of the smaller churches felt that their gifts were so small that they were hardly entitled to a voice in the matter, though ready to abide by any action taken by the Conference. The thoroughness and fairness of spirit in which some churches, notably the larger givers, discussed the proposed measures is most gratifying. Of the churches which took definite action after thorough discussion a small majority is recorded against any change of relation between the Conference and the Association at the present time. In view of the results of this referendum, your Board of Directors deems any action upon the proposition at this meeting inadvisable and recommends that it be laid upon the table.

As your Secretary has gone about his work, coming in contact with ministers and churches, endeavoring to bring some quickening influence to bear upon them, the word oftenest in his heart and upon his lips has been "Faith." Latterly, he has phrased it "Social Faith." Individual faith is common among us, social faith still is rare; freedom we have, but fellowship in other than small circles is still to be achieved. Most of us are quite satisfied to be in *small* groups, we seem to distrust our capacity to touch and move the great mass of mankind. We need the brave word of Mazzini:

"The peoples lack faith; not that individual faith which creates martyrs, but that social faith which is the parent of victory. The faith that arouses the multitudes; faith in their own destiny, in their own mission, and in the mission of the epoch. When that faith shall be not only on our lips but in our hearts; when our acts shall correspond to our words, and virtue shall sanctify our life, as liberty has sanctified our intelligence; when we appear before men as seekers after Good, and they say of us amongst themselves: These men are a living religion—thinkest thou our appeal to the peoples will not meet with a ready response?" ERNEST CHARLES SMITH,
Secretary.

NOTES ON ALLIANCE SESSION.

The Alliance Women of the Western Conference met on Tuesday, May 18th, at 2:30 p. m., Mrs. Eugene R. Shippen of Detroit presiding. In lieu of a Secretary's report from last year, mention was made of the fact that last year Mrs. Smith presided and Mrs. Shippen spoke on "Aggressive Unitarianism" and Mrs. Churchill of New Orleans on "Alliance Work."

The presiding officer of the day suggested that in order to give the Alliance some semb'ance of organization for working purposes, we elect a President of the Western Conference, and possibly a Secretary and Treasurer. Discussion brought out the fact that the two Vice-Presidents of the National Alliance are our officers and might serve. Mrs. Saunders of Cincinnati moved that we organize into an Associate Alliance of the Western Conference. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Mrs. Saunders again moved that one of our Western Vice-Presidents be the Chairman of the meeting next year and the other, the Secretary and Treasurer, and the following year the duties be exchanged. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

It was moved that these two officers and the President of the Alliance of the entertaining church constitute the Program Committee for the next Conference. Motion was seconded and carried.

Mrs. Shippen spoke on her ideas for a flourishing A'liance; that as there are young and old among the women, they should all work together with happiness and zeal, and that in order to do this there should be different branches to suit the abilities and preferences of the various members; there should be the Junior branch for the young matrons who do not care to do sewing, because if we do not bring in new life, the Alliance will die off. She referred to the report of one delegate who said: "By removal and death we have come down to four members." This is something that can happen to all of us. Having talks or round tables is one thing that will interest the young matrons. Study of the care of children and discipline, or housekeeping interests the Junior Alliance women. The young life must be brought into the Alliance if it is going to grow and flourish.

Secondly, unless the Alliance takes an interest in the Sunday school and stands behind it, the weakness will be found there, because there is your feeder to the Alliance and to the church. The same may be said with reference to the young people's union or the young people of the church.

Third, publicity: The idea of inviting friends of the members of the Alliance who are not themselves members, certain days of the year, and giving a chance to people outside the church who may want to become members of the church. We should go out into the highways and hedges and compel people to come in. We are too prone to let evolution take its course, and presently along comes a Christian Scientist who is wanting to tell about his religion and takes our prospect away.

A fourth point to be emphasized is loyalty in church-going; support the church on Sunday as well as on Alliance day.

Fifth, programs. Our Alliance programs should not compete with the Woman's Club on their own subjects. The Women's Clubs generally are so much larger than the Alliance that they can have more varied programs than we can give. If we keep to the religious subjects we have no rival anywhere. That is the function of the Alliance. The following are suggestive:

What are Unitarian mothers doing for the religion of their children?

Have mothers the right to bias their children religiously?

Does religious freedom mean neglect?

The worshipful church vs. the institutional church.

Does professional philanthropy tend to deaden our personal feeling?

Unitarians and prayer.

Wives as missionaries to their husbands.

Woman—vanishing and advancing ideals of woman.

Mrs. Shippen then introduced the speaker of the afternoon, Mrs. Claude U. Gilson of Wellesley Hills, Mass., Delegate from the General Alliance and Alliance Editor of *Word and Work*. Mrs. Gilson's subject was "The Meeting-House on the Hill," from which she brought out her ideal of a church and its meetings. What are we keeping of the heritage that belongs to us as a free people, and how far are we free people? We should always keep the democracy of the old church. We should hold to its simplicity, its hospitality. There shou'd always be an atmosphere of reverence and high-mindedness in the Alliance meetings. It should be a sanctuary. We should get together on a friendly basis and work together. Stanton Coit in a recent book said, "The world awaits a spiritual message from America." The Alliances should help to get a plan for church unity—a real spirit of religion, not only denominationalism. A very good idea making for religious unity is to have a Union Fair, all the Protestant churches getting together for this occasion, and the proceeds being divided among those participating. This brings the community together. Have joint meetings where members of different churches get together to discuss different problems. In this way we will lose our intense spirit of individualism.

Discussion of Mrs. Gilson's talk followed, in which suggestions were made for increasing church interest. A go-to-church-Sunday campaign was suggested. A religious census was found to be helpful in several localities.

Miss Fanny Field of Cincinnati next spoke on her work as a member of the International Committee. This committee was formed as a means of taking care of the Liberal women scattered over Europe. The movement started with a meeting in Boston at which Miss Herford and Lady Baring of England were present. They were so impressed that they went back to England determined to carry out the work in London. The movement grew among the European nations until in 1910 it was possible to hold an International Congress of Liberal Women. This was held in Berlin. In 1914 the movement had so grown that at the International Congress in Paris there were representatives from England, France, Germany, America, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Since the war started the organization has been of great service by means of a chain of letters in locating sons or daughters or mothers or fathers for their families who thought them lost or slain. It has also been of service in helping to get nurses.

FELLOWSHIP NOTICES.

Rev. Paul Harris Drake, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted June 2, 1915. Committee: Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

Rev. Walter A. Tuttle, of the Universalist ministry, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted June 2, 1915. Committee: Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

The New England Fellowship Committee has received from Rev. William B. Watson, of the Universalist ministry, an application for the certificate of commendation issued by this committee. Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens, Secretary, 10 Prospect St., Fitchburg, Mass.

The New England Fellowship Committee has received from William Short, Jr., of the Episcopal Theological School, an application for the certificate of commendation issued by this committee. Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens, Secretary, 10 Prospect St., Fitchburg, Mass.

The New England Fellowship Committee has received from George William Bell of Stoneham, Mass., an application for the certificate of commendation issued by this committee. Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens, Secretary, 10 Prospect St., Fitchburg, Mass.

THE REPORT OF THE COMITY COMMITTEE OF THE UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE.

The Comity Committee, which is composed of Rev. Charles F. Dole, Rev. Christopher R. Eliot, Rev. B. R. Bulkeley, Rev. Elizabeth Padgham, Charles L. De Normandie, Percy A. Atherton, Miss Marion D. Richards, Secretary and Edgar S. Wiers, Chairman, has met faithfully once each month with but one exception since the fall and every member of the committee has been present at times and usually all but one, and the President of the Fellowship has joined in these monthly deliberations.

The committee has carefully considered the matter of the alleged interferences with the choice of candidates for vacant pulpits and has had conferences with several individual ministers and with committees of the National Conference, the Ministerial Union and the American Unitarian Association.

The committee had three specific cases brought to its attention. Two of the men appeared before the committee and the other stated his case in full in correspondence. All considered themselves victims of discrimination and injustice. It became apparent to the committee early in its work that to constitute itself a judicial body to weigh all the evidence in each case and make a report on the right and wrong, the justice and injustice of each, would require hours and days and was beyond its power. It decided, therefore, to address itself, not to the past history of the cases, but to the present necessities, and devoted its efforts as a committee and the efforts of its members as individuals to untangling official red tape and securing hearings for those who felt they had been discriminated against. It believes that it has been of some assistance in these endeavors.

It became apparent that the individual cases brought to its attention were the result of an unco-ordinated system of denominational organization and it has devoted its main efforts to a study of this system, some of its members conferring with members of the commission already appointed by the American Unitarian Association to study the matter of candidating. The report of that commission has already been made and acted upon at the Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association on Tuesday last. We can present our own conclusions in regard to the system by a brief summary:

1. The old congregational method of each church choosing its own minister as it sees fit has been interfered with to a greater or less extent by such agencies as the Committee on Fellowship of the General Conference, the Committee on Supply of the Ministerial Union, and the American Unitarian Association.

2. A full statement of the specific functions and interrelations of these different agencies has been drawn up by the committee and can be presented, if it be desired.

3. That men of marked individuality have sought fellowship with the Unitarian body, drawn towards the Unitarian fellowship because of its supposed freedom from dogma and denominational control, thereby offering an opportunity for the exposition of widely differing theories and ideas, not always in accord with the somewhat stereotyped ideas of church services, activities, and functions, which have heretofore largely prevailed.

4. That a large majority of the Unitarian parishes, particularly those in New England, as represented by the leading members of those parishes, are conservative and not naturally receptive to novel theories and ideas and aggressive personalities.

5. That the different agencies above referred to and their officers have not been able, nor have they always had the inclination, to adapt themselves and their rules of procedure to meet the new needs and to carry on our work along radical political and social, as well as radical religious, lines.

6. That the general result is that the American Unitarian Association, as it has grown in wealth and power, has overshadowed the other agencies. While theoretically it does not interfere with any parish in its choice of a minister, as a matter of fact, the advice and guidance of its executive officers are sought and given.

To what extent this advice may be helpful depends entirely upon the impartiality of the officers who give it, whether their attitude be one of open-mindedness to new thoughts and unusual personalities, or excessive carefulness that certain supposedly conservative and rich parishes need not be shocked by radical utterances.

The work demanded, if done at all, calls for unusual judgment in those who actually do this work and the responsibility that goes with this work should be frankly accepted by that agency which, from the nature of the case, can best perform the work. In theory the responsibility is divided now among two or three different organizations. That responsibility is not definitely placed upon anyone. Practically, the American Unitarian Association, with its convenient headquarters, its staff of executive officers, its control of the funds and property of some of the churches, exerts a strong influence in the determination of what candidates are heard by the different parishes and through advice and guidance of its officers, what ones are chosen.

The present situation is one of irresponsible authority. The body which really does exercise the strongest influence is not held accountable for it. We believe the authority is inevitable, but that full responsibility should go with it.

7. Inasmuch as the Committee on Fellowship of the Conference is made up of busy ministers, active in their own parishes, and unable, therefore, to give much time to the matter in hand, and inasmuch as the Secretary of the Committee on Supply of Pulpits, whose salary is paid by the American Unitarian Association, gives only part of his time to the work in hand, and inasmuch as the American Unitarian Association through its many officers can always be reached at headquarters, and has already through those officers obtained a large, even if indirect, influence in the choice

of ministers for vacant parishes, your committee suggests:

A. That the General Conference no longer be given any authority over the list of ministers published in the Year Book.

B. That the Ministerial Union, as it has no funds to adequately perform the task in hand, no longer assume that function or in any way be subsidized by the A. U. A.

C. That the A. U. A. assume whatever work is necessary in regard to all these matters, and that rules to govern the performance of such work be carefully formulated by the Directors of the A. U. A. after consultation with all the different agencies.

In addition to this report Mr. Dole wished to make certain statements regarding his own opinion upon this important matter, which, while not in opposition to the opinion of the committee, brings to the foregoing a slightly different point of view and sets forth the responsibility which our churches as congregational bodies should assume. Mr. Dole's statement follows:

A. That the Associations of Ministers in the various Conferences of our churches be each asked to carefully appoint a Fellowship Committee of three members to receive the proper credentials and give suitable greeting to such ministers as may be newly settled in any of the churches of the Conference or who may wish to join our body.

B. That the churches be earnestly reminded that under our Congregational polity the responsibility of choosing their ministers rests solely with themselves, and cannot safely be laid upon the officers of the A. U. A. who are unacquainted with all the candidates for our ministry and cannot therefore in any case do more than to give such unofficial advice as other busy laymen or ministers may occasionally be able to furnish.

C. That so far as a certain amount of office help is necessary to give information about churches needing ministers, and ministers or candidates seeking pulpits for occasional or permanent supply, the A. U. A. should provide for the maintenance of such an office, make the necessary rules for its conduct, and be ready to give impartial information as accurate as possible to those who need it.

D. That it be always understood, and published accordingly, that the list of ministers printed in the Year Book is for convenience only, and, like other professional lists, does not undertake except in the most general way to guarantee the character of the individuals composing it.

YOUR ROSEBUD CHILD.

By James G. Townsend.

I see your tears, but for that angel-one
  You should not weep; for in life's sad refrain
There's no grief like membrance of ill deeds done:
  Your child, unstained, finds Heaven without sin's pain.

THE JOURNEY.

By Harriet Lake-Burch.

We were so young, so glad—is it not so?
  And joining hands we frolicked in the sun
Glad with the flowers and birds—is it not so?
  And no one said us nay—not one.

Today we are surprised—is it not so?
  That all the lovely morning hours are gone—
Surprised at our own faces, that they show
  Us different than we were at dawn.

We *are* surprised—a little—Even so
  The summit has perspectives to the sun
Glad with the birds and flowers, come, let us go,
  No one shall say us nay—not one.

FELLOWSHIP NOTICES.

Rev. Charles Edward Beals, formerly of the Congregational ministry, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted March 16, 1915. Committee: Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

Frederick Max Eliot, of the Harvard Divinity School, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted April 22, 1915. Committee: Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

Rev. Oluf Tandberg, of the Universalist ministry, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted April 22, 1915. Committee: Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

Rev. Louis J. Richards, of the Universalist ministry, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted April 22, 1915. Committee: Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

The Rev. John Irwin Flick is hereby commended to the ministers and churches of the Unitarian Fellowship for a probationary period of six months, ending November 10, 1915. Certificate issued May 10, 1915. Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens, Committee for New England.

The New England Fellowship Committee has received from Rev. J. Fagginger Auer, of the German Evangelical Protestant Ministry, an application for the certificate of commendation issued by this committee. Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens, Secretary, 10 Prospect St., Fitchburg, Mass.

The New England Fellowship Committee has received from Rev. Lewis Welton Sanford, of the Baptist ministry, an application for the certificate of commendation issued by this committee. Charles T. Billings, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens, Sec., 10 Prospect St., Fitchburg, Mass.

INDEX TO VOLUME FIVE

SEPTEMBER, 1914—JULY, 1915.

NOTE: *This Index includes only the more important articles and does not aim to be exhaustive.*

EDITORIALS.

America and the War. 131.
American Unitarian Association Publication Department. 69.
Anniversary Week Resolutions. 323.
Anniversary Week at Its Four Score Years and Ten. (E. S. W.) 294.
Billy Sunday. 132, 195, 227, 260, 324.
Congregationalists and Unitarians. 325.
Direct Primaries. 69.
Equal Franchise. 229, 262.
Forums and the Democratization of Religion. (E. S. W.) 70.
Hymn-book by Unitarian Writers. 37.
Installation of Ministers. 102.
Lodge (Dr.) and Immortality. 165.
Lusitania Tragedy. 291.
Missionary Work and Congregational Method. 227.
Outcome of the War. 100.
Prayer and the War. 67.
Presbyterian Heresy. 293.
President Wilson's Peace Policy. 291.
Recent Elections. 100.
Religion and the War. 35.
Second Church in Boston. 163.
Temperance and the War. 259, 292.
"Unitarian Misrepresentation." 5.
Unitarian Name (The). 4.
Unitarian Statistics. 229.
Universalist Creed. 132.
Unpopular Review. 68, 260.
War. 3, 35, 67, 100, 131, 259, 291, 292.
Woman's Alliance. 102.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES.

America's Great Duty. E. B. Backus. 175.
American Good Will. Mary W. Ovington. 176.
Attitude of America (The). S. M. Crothers. 174.
Browning and a Noted Hymn. S. G. Pomeroy. 21.
Christ-Man (The). G. F. Patterson. 265.
Collapse of European Civilization. A. R. Vail. 77.
Constructive Virtue. G. R. Gebauer. 271.
Dominant Strain in Today's Religion. A. C. Deffenbach. 43.
Efficiency. E. D. Martin. 54.
Ethics and Intellectual Power. J. G. Townsend. 273.
Function of Worship (The). S. R. Maxwell. 167.
Goodness and Brains. E. D. Martin. 6.
Greatest of These (The). J. G. Townsend. 25.
Has Christianity Failed? A. P. Reccord. 135.
Man's Part in the Creative Process. A. L. Weatherly. 39.
Mediation in Industry. J. E. Williams. 16.
Natural History of Sin. The Editor. 134.
New and Higher Type of Revival. J. T. Sunderland. 268.
On the Firing Line. E. H. Reeman. 299.
Praying and Fighting. Geo. Kent. 272.
Progressive Christianity More Than Liberal Belief. G. R. Gebauer. 7.
Real Division in Christianity (The). E. H. Reeman. 22.
Religion and Illiteracy. Maxwell Savage. 145.
Responsibility for the Truth. A. L. Weatherly. 59.
Sane Sunday (A). The Editor. 18.
Time Serving and Serving the Times. G. R. Gebauer. 239.
Tomorrow's Religion. W. S. Swisher. 235.
Unitarian Name in the West (The). R. S. Loring. 52.
Unknown God (The). C. E. Snyder. 199.
Wanted: Better Democracy. C. F. Dole. 85.
Wanted: Men! C. R. Reese. 207.
What the Modern Business World Is Teaching the Church. E. H. Reeman. 105.
Why I Am a Unitarian. E. B. Backus. 48.
Why People Stay Away From Church. F. A. Hinckley. 231.

SYMPOSIUM.

The Unitarian Name. 10.

POETRY.

Aspiration. Sarah E. Burton. 277.
Between Midnight and Morning. Owen Seaman. 224.
Dream (A). Walt Whitman. 59.
Divine Compassion (The). Henry Van Dyke. 42.
Heroism. R. S. Gilder. 258.
His People. C. P. S. 83.
Illusions of War. R. LeGallienne. 2.
Journey (The). H. Lake-Burch. 306.
La Via. H. Lake-Burch. 9.
My Prayer. Mabel H. Coyle. 234.
Parallels. Charles S. Parke. 288.
Perfect Day (The). H. Lake-Burch. 226.
Poets (The). C. S. P.
Set of a Soul (The). 128.
Towards the Morning. C. H. Herford. 271.
Two Men of Power. H. O. Morgan. 103.
Two Quatrains. Edwin Markham. 166.

ILLUSTRATED SKETCHES OF CHURCHES.

Atlanta, Ga. Frank Lederic. 296.
Boston, The Second Church. 170.
Cincinnati. 204.
Cleveland Unity Church. 72.
Dayton, O. 138.
Wheeling, W. Va. 109.

THE MODERN CHURCH AND SOCIAL JUSTICE.

By John Haynes Holmes.

War. 55.
Our Lost Safeguards. 80.
The Church and the War. 113.
Some Books to Read These Days. 141.

Who Is to Blame? 178.
War Against War in Time of War. 240.
America and the Great War. 274.
The Church's Second Failure. 212.
Should Clergymen Fight? 301.

PRAYERS.

Against War. Walter Rauschenbusch. 38.
Beginning of a New Day. G. F. Patterson. 239.
For Peace. John Haynes Holmes. 194.

OUR READERS' EXCHANGE.

Billy Sunday. Blanche Watson. 301.
Chaney, A Tribute to George Leonard Chaney. 84.
"Church of the Future (The)." T. D. Eliot. 53.
New Hymn-book (The). Frederick Gill and J. H. Holmes. 20.
Unitarian Name (The). N. H. Blackmer. 53.

NEWS ARTICLES.

Anniversary Meetings. 307.
Anti-Alcohol Motor Car. 287.
Canadian News. 158.
Chaney Window at Atlanta. 160.
Commission on New Denominational Name. 26.
Congress of Liberals at Philadelphia. 230.
Gratz, Ky. (The Mission at). 62.
Joseph Priestley Conference. 190.
Meadville Institute. 28.
Meadville Theological School. 218.
Middle States Conference. 151.
Missionary Work in a Canadian City. 209.
Montreal Church in War Times. 191.
New Experiment in Sunday School Methods. 127.
Social Service Institute. 285.
Southern Conference Meetings. 318.
Spokane, Wash. 256.
Tribute to Dr. Thayer. 287.
Unity Tracts. 181.
Western Conference Meetings. 278.
Western Conference New Endowment Work. 221.
New England Letters. Chas. P. Wellman. 64, 91, 121, 155, 184, 223, 255, 280, 307.
Middle States Letters. Edgar S. Weir. 93, 121, 147, 188, 216, 252, 283, 310.
Western Conference News. E. C. Smith. 27, 60, 87, 117, 154, 185, 219, 247, 279, 313.
Southern Conference News. 90, 125, 157, 182, 244, 283, 318.
New York League. 120, 158, 189, 222, 251, 288.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Christianity and Civilization (Church). 96.
Clear Grit. (Collyer). 31.
Culture of Ancient Israel. (Cornill). 32.
Democratic Rhine-Maid. (Gifford). 104.
Far Journey. (Rihbany). 103.
God Who Found Himself (The). (Smith). 95.
Heresy of Cain. (Hodges). 96.
Historical Christ. (Conybeare). 32.
Is Death the End? (Holmes). 319.
Little Lost Sister. (Brooks). 31.
Self Training for Mothers. (Lovejoy). 31.
The Test. (Howard). 96.

Advertising Rates

List prices per month: special discounts for longer contracts.

1 Page	$10.00
Half Page	6.00
Quarter Page	4.00

Copy for advertisements must be furnished by the 20th of each month.

Mr. Pulsford's Sermons

Recent Issues Are:

"Mountains and Men"
"The Wide Prospect"
"By What Authority"
"Wash in the Nearest River"
"Mere Getting Together"

Copies (5c each) may be had by mail from Unitarian Headquarters, 105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Pacific Unitarian School

for the Ministry.

BERKELEY, CAL. **Founded 1904**

Aims at thorough and scientific scholarship; emphasizes the application of religious ideals to municipal and social as well as individual life; gives complete preparation for the modern ministry and social service. It works in co-operation with the University of California and other Divinity Schools and affords an unusually wide choice of courses. Open to both sexes.

The year begins August 16, 1915. Write for the Register and complete information to the President,

EARL MORSE WILBUR, D. D.,
Pacific Unitarian School, Berkeley, California.

Unity Tracts

and

Unity Short Tracts

now available for free distribution.
Write to

UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS
105 So. Dearborn St., CHICAGO.

The Meadville Theological School

(Established 1844)

MEADVILLE, PA.

Trains men and women for a liberal and progressive ministry.

For catalogue address the president,

F. C. SOUTHWORTH

Point Breeze Inn and Bungalows

Located on an island off the coast. The woods, fields, and rocky shores, the pure sea air scented with the odor of evergreen trees, make an attractive place. Quiet and homelike. Accommodates sixty. Booklet. Address, J. H. Ambrose, Medomak, Me.

Western Unitarian Headquarters

The Western Unitarian Conference maintains offices at 105 South Dearborn St., Chicago, which are open daily from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. (Saturdays 9 a. m. to 3 p. m.). All publications of the American Unitarian Association, including those of the Religious Education Department, and of Unity Publishing Committee, as well as all denominational periodicals are kept on sale and for distribution.

Secretary, REV. ERNEST C. SMITH
Headquarters Clerk, MISS LINA SCHEIBLE

Things Commonly Believed Amongst Unitarians Today

WE DECLARE our fellowship to be conditioned on no doctrinal tests and welcome all who wish to join us to help establish truth and righteousness and love in the world:

We believe that to love the Good and live the Good is the supreme thing in religion:

We hold reason and conscience to be final authorities in matters of religious belief:

We honor the Bible and all inspiring scripture, old or new:

We revere Jesus and all holy souls that have taught men truth and righteousness and love, as prophets of religion:

We believe in the growing nobility of man:

We trust the unfolding Universe as beautiful, beneficent, unchanging Order; to know this order is truth; to obey it is right and liberty and stronger life:

We believe that good and evil inevitably carry their own recompense, no good thing being failure, and no evil thing success; that heaven and hell are states of being; that no evil can befall the good man in either life or death; that all things work together for the victory of good:

We believe that we ought to join hands and work to make the good things better and the worst good, counting nothing good for self that is not good for all:

We believe that this self-forgetting, loyal life awakes in man the sense of union, here and now, with things eternal—the sense of deathlessness; and this sense is to us an earnest of the life to come:

We worship One in-All,—that Life whence suns and stars derive their orbits and the soul of man its Ought,—that Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, giving us power to become the sons of God,—that Love with whom our souls commune. This One we name—the Eternal God our Father.